This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

0

James Chrystal.

☆Estate of Rev James Chrystal
April 6 '09

12 **BINGHAM (J.) WORKS**, viz., Antiquities of the Christian Church, etc., with Life of the Author and a copious Index, edited by his lineal descendant, R. BINGHAM, 10 vols, 8vo, *cloth*, **BEST EDITION**, £1 6s

Oxford University Press, 1855

"Bingham, a man of learning and judgment, of Christian candour and rare moderation, undertook in his great work of the 'Origines' to establish a sounder method for the historical criticism of the earliest liturgies. Bingham is the most distinguished Christian antiquarian, and on the whole not only the most learned but also the fairest of all apologetical writers."—BUNSEN'S ANALECTA.

10V. 4-26-19

THE WORKS

OF

THE REV. JOSEPH BINGHAM, M.A.

EDITED BY

HIS LINEAL DESCENDANT

THE REV. R. BINGHAM, JUN., M.A.

FORMERLY OF MAGDALENE HALL, OXFORD,

AND

FOR MANY YEARS CURATE OF TRINITY CHURCH, GOSPORT.

A NEW EDITION, IN TEN VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

OXFORD:

AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

M.DCCC.LV.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
506430
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.
R 1910 L

TABLE OF GENERAL CONTENTS.

VOL. I.

PROLEGOMENA, viz. The Editor's Introduction. The Life of the Author. The Author's original Prefaces, &c.

THE ANTIQUITIES OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, Book I—III. Names and Orders of the People. Orders of the Superior Clergy. Orders of the Inferior Clergy.

VOL. II.

PROLEGOMENA, viz. The Prefaces of Buddeus and Grischovius, originally prefixed to the Latin Version of the Author's Works.

THE ANTIQUITIES OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, Books IV—VII. Ordinations of the Clergy. Privileges, Revenues, &c. Laws of their Life and Conversation. Ascetics and Monks.

VOL. III.

THE ANTIQUITIES OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, Books VIII—X. Churches, Utensils, Habits, &c. Provinces, Dioceses, &c. Catechumens, Creeds, &c. Indices to the Episcopal Sees, &c. Plans of Churches, and Maps.

VOL. IV.

THE ANTIQUITIES OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, Books XI—XIII. The Rites and Ceremonies of Baptism. Confirmation and other Ceremonies following Baptism. Divine Worship in general.

VOL. V.

THE ANTIQUITIES OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, Books XIV and XV. The Ante-Communion Service. The Communion Service itself.

VOL. VI.

THE ANTIQUITIES OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, Book XVI. The Unity and Discipline of the Ancient Church.

VOL. VII.

THE ANTIQUITIES OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, Books XVII—XXI. Discipline among the Clergy. The Orders of Penitents. Of Absolution. The Festivals and Fasts.

VOL. VIII.

THE ANTIQUITIES OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, Books XXII and XXIII. Marriage Rites. Funeral Rites. The Indices of Authors, Councils, and Matter. Errata, Corrigenda, and Addenda.

VOL. IX.

THE SCHOLASTICAL HISTORY OF BAPTISM BY LAYMEN. A DISSERTATION ON THE EIGHTH NICENE CANON. Indices of Authors and Matter.

VOL. X.

THE FRENCH CHURCH'S APOLOGY FOR THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. SERMONS AND LETTERS ON ABSOLUTION. SERMONS ON THE TRINITY, THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST, &c. Indices of Authors and Matter.

INTRODUCTION.

SO long ago as the year 1843, while publishing a small volume of Lectures on the Divinity and Humanity of our Lord under the title of IMMANUEL, I mentioned, in the preface to my book, how desirous I was of presenting the Public with a new and improved edition of the ENTIRE WORKS of my Ancestor, Joseph Bingham, wherein I purposed to give *all quotations in full, as well as strictly verified from good and accredited copies of the original authors.*

This arduous task I have at length been permitted to accomplish, and that, as I humbly hope, not without the Divine blessing on sincerity of purpose and indefatigable application.

I will not, however, detain the Reader with any account of my personal toils, or of the very many difficulties with which I have had to contend during the progress of my labours, owing either to want of books, or to change of residence, or to domestic trials. Suffice it to say, for the information of numerous friends[a] and other persons who have been long waiting

[a] I may take this opportunity of expressing my sincere thanks to the individuals whose names follow, for various obligations respectively, either by the loan of books, or by advice and assistance in literary difficulties, or by personal acts of civility and kindness at different periods during the prosecution of my labours:—DR. MACBRIDE, the Principal of Magdalene Hall, Oxford; the REV. DR. CORRIE, the Master of Jesus College, Cambridge; the late LORD KENYON, and his Librarian, the REV. THOMAS AIREY, at Peel House near Manchester; the REV. CANON SLADE, the Vicar of Bolton-le-Moors; MR. THOMAS JONES, the Librarian at Cheatham's College, Manchester; the REV. DR. BANDINEL, the Librarian of the Bodleian; MR. PANIZZI and other Gentlemen at the British Museum; the REV. R. C. TRENCH, the Vicar of Itchen Stoke, Hants; and the well known theological booksellers, MR. DARLING of Little Queen Street,

for this edition, that, when in 1852 I was finally ready for the press, I found it impossible, from circumstances I need not particularize, to bring out the work in London on my own account, and was accordingly induced to adopt the suggestion of submitting my revised copy and improvements to the Delegates of the Oxford University Press, under whose auspices and at whose expense this edition now appears.

I proceed to give some account, which may be expected, of previous editions, beginning with the history of Mr. Bingham's writings and the periods at which they respectively appeared, and concluding with some further explanation and notice of the chief and distinctive features of the present publication of his WHOLE WORKS.

The earliest of his publications may be designated as THE TRINITY SERMONS, being three, the first of which was preached before the University in 1695, and the second and third in the two following years before the Bishop and Clergy at Winchester. They are again published, for the fourth time since 1829, in the latter part of the tenth volume of this edition, of which volume THE FRENCH CHURCH'S APOLOGY FOR THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, originally issued in 1706, forms the first part; followed in the same volume by THE SERMONS AND LETTERS ON ABSOLUTION, the latter of which were written in February, 1712-13, while the former of them were first delivered severally at Winchester Cathedral on the 8th and 22nd of May, 1715, and repeated as one discourse, with omissions and abbreviations, at the annual Visitation at Bishop-Waltham on September the 24th, 1716: at least so I find the dates given on the fly-leaf of the Author's original manuscript of these Sermons, which I happily possess. It may appear strange that the Letters, which were written before the Sermons were preached, should be printed after them; but in that order

MR. LESLIE of Great Queen Street, and MR. STEWART of King William Street, West Strand. I must also make my due acknowledgments for occasional hints from Gentlemen, with whom I am not personally acquainted, either by letter to my address, or through the medium of "Notes and Queries."

they were published in 1720 by the Author himself in his Appendix to the eighth volume of the ORIGINES, at the end of the Nineteenth Book.

I have thought it desirable to place in the ninth volume, by themselves, THE FIRST AND SECOND PARTS OF THE SCHOLASTICAL HISTORY OF BAPTISM BY LAYMEN, which appeared in 1712 and 1714 respectively, between the third and fourth volumes of THE ANTIQUITIES, together with THE DISSERTATION ON THE EIGHTH CANON OF THE COUNCIL OF NICE, which is virtually THE THIRD PART OF LAY-BAPTISM, though it did not appear till 1716, as I apprehend. I have never seen a copy of *the original pamphlet*, which I observe advertised in Knaplock's list at the end of the Author's eighth volume in 1720, which was first republished at the end of the folio edition of his collected works in 1726.

These tracts, however, in answer to Mr. Lawrence and Dr. Brett, formed no inconsiderable portion of the Lay-baptism Controversy between the nonjurors and the moderate party of that time, and among them THE DISSERTATION ON THE EIGHTH NICENE CANON was intended as a final rejoinder to Mr. Lawrence, whose First Part appeared while Mr. Bingham was composing his own First Part, with a view to the controversy generally, and to which he replied in the 'Appendix to his First Part, containing Some Remarks on the Historical Part of Mr. Lawrence's Writings, &c.' Then followed in 1714 Mr. Bingham's Second Part on the same subject, in which he again answers Dr. Brett, and in a long Appendix replies very fully to Mr. Lawrence's Second Part. These writings drew from that gentleman the Supplement to that Second Part, finally replied to in the NICENE DISSERTATION, as mentioned just above.

I have no clue to the precise time of the first delivery from the pulpit of the excellent SERMON ON THE MERCY OF GOD TO PENITENT SINNERS, which I have placed last in order in my tenth volume. But finding it noticed, as well as the NICENE DISSERTATION already spoken of, in Knaplock's rider at the end of the eighth volume of the Author's greater work, I apprehend that it had been previously published, perhaps about the time of the

DISSERTATION, or at any rate subsequently to the ABSOLUTION-SERMONS in 1715–16, to which probably it was intended to be a kind of sequel and conclusion. It was afterwards reprinted in the folio edition.

With respect to the Author's immortal work, THE ANTIQUITIES OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, the first volume, containing the first and second books, was originally published in 1708; and the second, comprising the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth books, in 1709. These two were reprinted in 1710, and this is the only part of the work that passed through a second edition during the Author's lifetime. The third volume, including the seventh, eighth, and ninth books, followed in 1711; but the fourth, which is made up of the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth books, did not issue till 1715, while THE FIRST AND SECOND PARTS OF THE HISTORY OF BAPTISM BY LAYMEN intervened, as I have shown before. The fifth volume containing the thirteenth book, one of the longest, and the sixth volume, which has the fourteenth and fifteenth, came out consecutively in 1719. The production of the seventh volume, consisting of a single book, the sixteenth and the longest of all, was the work of the earlier part of 1720, but before the end of that year the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth books were printed as the contents of the eighth volume, with its Appendix, consisting of THE SERMONS AND LETTERS ON ABSOLUTION. The *labor ultimus* produced in 1722 the ninth volume, or the twentieth, twenty-first, and twenty-second books, as well as the tenth, which was made up of the twenty-third book, the Index of Matter, and the Index of Authors. To his last two volumes the Author prefixed a long and learned Preface [b], replete with severe strictures on Mr. Blackamore's *Summary of Christian Antiquities* [c], as it was termed, which gave my

[b] Reproduced in the latter part of the *Prolegomena* prefixed to the present volume.

[c] This work was afterwards translated into German, and published in 1768–9, by F. E. Rambach, a compliment which it scarcely deserved, under the title of,—*Ant. Blackamore's Chr. Alterthümer, aus dem Engl. übersetzt.* I possess a copy of the Original, but I have not seen the Version.

Ancestor so much offence on account of its plagiarisms, deficiencies, and egregious errors.

The second edition of his works was that of 1726, in two volumes folio, by some booksellers in London, to whom the Author's widow sold the copyright, while his eldest son Richard, also Rector of Havant, superintended the press. This is a good reprint of all such parts of my Ancestor's writings as had been published under his own eye before his death in 1723, the year after the date of his last volume.

What I think may not improperly be termed *the third edition*, is *the Latin Version by Grischovius*, a Lutheran divine of the University of Halle, which he enriched by giving the citations *in extenso*, and accompanying the passages from the Greek Fathers with Latin translations also. The first part of this laborious work appeared in 1724, with an appropriate Introduction from the pen of the celebrated Buddeus. The remainder came out from time to time in detached volumes, ten in all, and was not completed till 1729. Still later, in 1738, Grischovius produced an eleventh tome, containing *the version of the minor works:* and the whole was reprinted at Halle in 1751–61. The Introduction of Buddeus and Prefaces of Grischovius I have prefixed to the second volume of this edition.

In the year 1766, *an abridgment of the* ANTIQUITIES, similar to Mr. Blackamore's, but without any due acknowledgment of the source from which it was derived, was brought out at Vienna under the following title,—*Lucii Paleotini Antiquitatum sive Originum Ecclesiasticarum Summa*, 1 *vol. 4to.*: and in 1788–96, an anonymous Roman Catholic author published at Augsburg, in 8vo., *another Compendium of Christian Antiquities*, in German[d], avowedly extracted from the works of Joseph Bingham, as he honestly admits in the title, though he prudentially withholds his own name, which probably he could not divulge with much prospect of personal impunity[e].

[d] This Compendium was termed,—*Jos. Bingham's Alterthümer der Kirche, ein auszug aus der Engl. ausgabe.*

[e] The following passage from Mrs. Trollope's "Vienna and the

It is remarkable, that nearly a century elapsed before there seemed to be any call for *a third edition* of Mr. Bingham's works in this country; but in 1829, my Father brought out *a reprint of all the contents of the old octavo and folio editions*, introducing into the notes some further references from the Author's manuscript annotations in a private copy of his own book, and adding for the first time an impression of the THREE TRINITY SERMONS, of which I have spoken before.

These *further references* I have not only reproduced, but have given *in extenso* the quotations which respectively belong to them, wherever they occur: and this is one point in which my edition will be found superior to all others.

This publication encountered numerous obstacles in its progress through the press, and was much impeded in its distribution among the subscribers to it, as well as in the sale of the other copies, by a printer's bankruptcy during the period it was coming out. In fine, the remaining sheets were purchased by Mr. Straker, a theological bookseller in London, I believe early in the year 1837, who quickly disposed of them, and afterwards brought out, in 1840, *a fourth edition of the Whole Works*, together with the *Life of the Author*, and those additions in the *Opuscula*, of which the copyright belonged to my family. For this Mr. Straker had our permission. His editor, however, the Rev. J. R. Pitman, did not print *the further references*, to which I have alluded above. The quotations, too, in that reprint from the Latin Version were repeated, apparently, without collation, or verification, or correction, just as they came from the pen of Grischovius or his amanuensis. In justice, however, to Mr. Pitman, I am bound to add, that he considerably improved the next reprint between 1843–45, *the fifth English edition of the Whole Works*, or *sixth*, if we

Austrians" will not be out of place here: (Lond. 1837. vol. 1. p. 158.) 'At the Library of the Franciscans, [at Salzburg,] they found Bingham's Ecclesiastical Antiquities behind a locked grating, and were told by the librarian, that it was a *liber prohibitus;* and that one monk only in the convent had the Pope's license to read prohibited books: that *he* might himself obtain the same permission if he applied for it, but that his avocations left him very little time to read at all.'

reckon the Latin; and which, in respect of the typography, does as much credit to the printer as, in regard of the scholarship, it reflects honour on the curator[f].

The sixth in English, or *seventh edition in order of time*, may be briefly mentioned; I mean *Mr. Bohn's reprint of the Antiquities alone*, in two volumes, imperial 8vo., and double columns, which was thrown upon the market in 1845. This book, re-issued also in 1852, is a verbatim copy of the original octavo edition.

It will now be time to notice the distinctive features and chief improvements of *the seventh*, or otherwise *the eighth edition* of these Works, which I am thus placing in the hands of the Public, and in conducting which I have had mainly in view the literary benefit of junior students.

It will, moreover, be observed, that I have not been as anxious to effect an uniformity of bulk in the volumes themselves, as I have been careful to *group the subjects* as much as I possibly could: and while I thought it a mere waste of letter-press to run the name of the work along the headings of the pages, from end to end, I judged it would be very advantageous to enrich the openings with the cream of each chapter, or nearly so, while by placing the titles of the sections in the margin, as well as by a moderate use of *italics*, I have enabled the reader to catch in a moment the topic he may want by a rapid glance of the eye.

The *text* is reproduced without alteration of any kind, except in three or four places where it seemed absolutely needful to change a word without altering the sense; except too that the spelling has been generally modernized: but if there be any where an interpolation, it is distinguished by brackets.

With respect to *references* and *quotations* it has been thought advisable, in order to economize space, not to recapitulate in

[f] The Index of Matter in this edition is professedly improved; but I think it was an error to have intermingled the subject of THE LAY-BAPTISM and THE APOLOGY, as well as the titles of THE SERMONS, &c., with the substance of THE ANTIQUITIES. The Maps, the orthography of which is very incorrect, are lithographic copies of the plates originally employed for my Father's edition of 1829.

the notes even the abbreviated forms of the names of authors cited in the text; but in the case where a work is mentioned without the specification of the writer, the name, either abbreviated or in full *pro re nata*, will be found at the commencement of the corresponding note.

Throughout the edition *two sorts of brackets* have been used; and of these the *angular* denote, as hinted just above, an interpolation or addition by myself, and peculiar to this copy; while the *lunar* designate my own verifications, except where there is an evident parenthesis, or a distinct citation of Scripture, in the text.

It must be remembered also that *the lunar brackets in the notes* are strictly in connection with *the corresponding signs in the Indices of Authors*, where they inclose and so mark the peculiar edition which I have consulted for the purposes of collating and verifying, whether the edition be identically that which my Ancestor employed or otherwise. Consequently the Reader, who would know what edition of Jerome, Augustine, or Chrysostome, for example, I have had recourse to, as marked respectively in the *notes*, must first turn to the corresponding name in the *Index of Authors*, and then the edition which he there observes within the lunar brackets will be *that*, as to place and date, which I have adopted for verifying from, respectively, throughout this entire edition. Whenever I have purposely employed some other edition of an author, the case is especially distinguished by *the name of the author* or *date of the edition* so used.

The places, which Grischovius has marked with a dagger, thus †, as *false* or *indistinct citations*, sometimes observing that *Clarissimus Binghamus errat*, I have generally found to be *no mistake at all*, except that the figures are misprinted or the reference has been made to a wrong chapter, section, or page. Most of these I have by a little extra trouble or perseverance found out and inserted, and I do not hesitate to say that *Clarissimus Binghamus* is scarcely ever wrong in the main, and that the instances are rare indeed in which he asserts what he does not prove; I confess, though, that some

of these daggers, owing possibly to a mere misprint, have cost me many a long hour; nay, sometimes I have given the matter up in despair, returned to it again some other day, corresponded with a distant friend on the *nodus*, scrutinized epitomes and indexes, and *found at last the object of my search*, often after many weeks or even months.

That my labour has not been very light will be readily admitted when the Reader is reminded that Joseph Bingham refers to *upwards of one thousand authors*, whose extensive works, including different editions of some of them, amount to *little short of four thousand volumes*, many of them being ponderous folios or bulky quartos; while the citations of Fathers, Councils, Canonists, Historians, Controversialists, and other authorities, would perhaps be equal to *some sixteen thousand passages*, for the most part in Greek or Latin, and ranging from the length of a few words or a single line to considerable paragraphs.

If, however, amid such a mass of citations and tens of thousands of lines I have made *some mistakes*,—I will not say,

Quas aut incuria fudit,

for no mortal man could have taken more pains to be correct, but rather,

Aut humana parum cavit natura,—

the Candid Reader will know how to pardon me; and of this I can most conscientiously assure him, that he may depend upon *the reality of the verifications* and *the fidelity of the citations* according to the editions specified as employed; so much so, that if haply in controversy he may wish to quote the canon of some Council or the clause of an Author, he may do so fearlessly *from my text*, if he cannot get access, for want of time or opportunity, to the very book he may respectively be wishing to cite.

It will be noticed that I have made *entirely new Indices of Authors and Councils*, that I have also given *an additional list of them in chronological order*, and have endeavoured to enrich them by numerous *biographical and bibliographical annotations*, which cannot but assist the student, and serve as directories to the proper sources of more extensive knowledge.

The Index of Matter to the Antiquities I have very considerably improved; but *the Ground-plans of the Churches* and *the Maps*, which together with *the Geographical Indices* I have placed at the end of the third volume, are reproduced from the plates of the edition of 1829, as they were, except that I have revised them and restored the orthography of many names, which were incorrectly spelt in previous impressions.

Errata, Corrigenda, and *Addenda*, in THE ANTIQUITIES, will be found at the end of my eighth volume after the *Indices*. These will of course disappear wholly, or be incorporated in the work, at the next opportunity.

I will only remark on *the last two volumes of this set containing the* OPUSCULA, that I believe this is the first time these minor works have been *edited*, however often they have been published. Hitherto they have been reproduced without note, comment, or explanation, as they came from the Author's hand. But I have carefully revised them, and have added *numerous explanatory notes and back references*, and to each of these volumes I have given *its appropriate Indices of Authors and Matter*, analogous to those which are appended to the main work.

It is perhaps needless to say much in *commendation of the* ORIGINES, which I thus have the honour of once more bringing forward; yet the mention of *a few testimonies* will not be out of place in conclusion.

The earliest will be found in *the Latin Prefaces of Buddeus and Grischovius*. Suffice it now to refer the Reader to the passage in the third page of Buddeus, commencing, *Quæ quidem gloria Binghamo nostro reservata videtur*, reciting the just eulogium with which the same author closes his Introduction: *Id certum positumque extra controversiam, nullum in hoc genere exstare scriptum, quo integra velut totius Antiquitatis Ecclesiasticæ imago exhibeatur, quod cum hocce comparari, multo minus eidem præferri, queat!*

Similar to this is the tribute which the learned Walch has also paid to the excellency of the same work in his *Bibliotheca Theologica:* (Jena, 1751, vol. 3, p. 671.)

Opus ipsum Binghami tam egregium est, ut merito inter

libros, quibus ANTIQUITATES ECCLESIASTICÆ *universæ enarratæ sunt, principatum teneat, sive ad rerum copiam atque apparatum, sive ad earum explanationem, animum advertere velimus. Commendat illud se accuratiori ordine, argumentis solidis, sive testimoniis quæ ex ipsis fontibus hausta ac diligenter adducta sunt, perspicuitate atque aliis virtutibus. Ac quamvis Auctor, iis addictus, qui in Anglia pro episcoporum auctoritate pugnant, ad horum sententias veteris ecclesiæ instituta trahat; animi tamen moderationem, quum in his rebus versatur, ostendit, ac si quæ corrigenda sunt, facile fieri potest emendatio.*

If further witness were required, we could allege the unanimous applause among ourselves of Dr. Waterland, Bishops Randolph, Tomline, and Coleridge, Dr. Burton, Mr. Bickersteth, and Mr. Dowling in his writings on the Study of Ecclesiastical History; as well as among the German authors, the unqualified praises of Augusti[ε]. These all agree, with one voice, in speaking of JOSEPH BINGHAM as the CORYPHÆUS OF ECCLESIASTICAL ARCHÆOLOGY.

[ε] Augusti's principal work, comprised in twelve octavo volumes, was published at Leipsic between the years 1817 and 1831, entitled thus,—*Denkwürdigkeiten aus der Christlichen Archäologie; mit beständiger Rücksicht auf die gegenwärtigen Bedürfnisse der Christlichen Kirche.* This was followed by a very useful manual termed, *Handbuch der Christlichen Archäologie.* A work by Siegel was also published at Leipsic, between 1835 and 1838, in 4 vols. 8vo.: *Handbuch der Christlich-kirchlichen Alterthümer in alphabetischer Ordnung, mit steter Beziehung auf das, was davon noch jetzt in Christlichen Cultus übrig geblieben ist.* See Riddle, (Lond. 1843, pp. 10 and 11,) who speaks very highly of this work, to which he owns himself especially indebted. Gericke's Ecclesiastical Archæology, published at Leipsic as recently as 1847, has been much commended for its goodness by my friend the Rev. R. C. Trench. I do not see that Mr. Riddle mentions *Krazer, De Apostolicis Liturgiis, August. Vind.* 1836. 1 *vol.* 8vo. In one place, (b. 1, ch. 2, s. 8, vol. 1, p. 19, n. 5,) I have myself referred, in an addition to the note, to Mamachi's *Origines et Antiquitates Christianæ, Romæ,* 1749–55, but I have omitted to mention it in the Index of Authors. This Roman Catholic work extends to six moderate quarto volumes, but was never completed. In another place, (b. 1, ch. 2, s. 12, vol. 1, p. 23, n. 18,) I have once cited a corresponding passage from Augusti, also unnoticed in the Index, because the work is of still more modern date even than Mamachi's.

But I will not attempt to add to these just commendations by a word of further praise from my feebler pen. HE BEING DEAD YET SPEAKETH; and, long after his humble editor shall have sunk into oblivion, will the Author of THE ANTIQUITIES OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH be remembered, valued, and consulted.

It is, however, some comfort to have one's name on the same page with that of such a writer; and this I can truly say, that it will be a source of pleasurable reflection to my dying hour, that by God's mercy I lived long enough to conduct through the press, if not so perfect an edition of these invaluable Works as might have been produced, yet possibly *the best by comparison* among those which have hitherto appeared; and if in the least degree I have contributed to the literature of the age, or been instrumental in aiding the studies of *younger brethren*, the thought of having been useful will be no small satisfaction, and, remaining content with my lot, whatever it be, I will cheerfully abide in my calling, while I THANK GOD AND TAKE COURAGE.

RICHARD BINGHAM, JUN.

London,
57, Gloucester Place, Portman Square,
Michaelmas, 1855.

If it be enquired how any one can possibly be an Atheist at this time of day, against so great Light & Conviction, such evidence & Demonstration of all sorts both from Reason & Revelation? I answer, tis strange indeed; but there is no disputing against matter of Fact. There are some men who openly declare war against Heaven, & make it their Business & Profession to dispute God out of y world as well as their own thoughts. There are others who will not plainly go but yet believe & persuade themselves in their own hearts that there is no God as much as ye former; And such mens thoughts, tho they will not speak them out may be as easily discerned by their works & actions, as ye Tree by its Fruits or ye Fountain by its Stream or any Natural Cause by ye genuine effects that necessarily & constantly flow from it. many men have assigned divers Reasons, but I think they may all be reduced to this one viz. The great Irregularity of mens lives & ye constant opposition of their wills to ye will of God. There are some Sins wch by a natural Influence and Operation do debase ye soul & vitiate ye understanding, so that the discerning Faculty becomes unable to perform its proper office or judge aright about things of a Spiritual nature: As he that immerged in Lust & Sensual Pleasures, becomes wholly chained to Sensible & material Objects, and all his Notions & Idea's partake of ye nature of ye things he has been so long ac-

II.

THE LIFE OF THE AUTHOR,

BY

HIS GREAT GRANDSON

THE REV. RICHARD BINGHAM, B.C.L.,

PREBENDARY OF CHICHESTER,

VICAR OF HALE MAGNA, NEAR SLEAFORD, LINCOLNSHIRE,

AND INCUMBENT OF TRINITY CHURCH, GOSPORT.

[PREFIXED TO THE EDITION OF 1829, IN NINE VOLUMES, 8VO.]

THE learned author of the ANTIQUITIES OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, and of the other Theological Tracts which are now[1] offered to the public in an uniform and complete edition, was born in September, 1668, at Wakefield, in Yorkshire, of which place his father, Mr. Francis Bingham, was a respectable inhabitant. He commenced his classical education at a school in that town, under Mr. Edward Clarke; and on the 26th of May, 1684, he was admitted a member of University College, in Oxford.

During his academical residence, he applied with persevering industry to those studies which are generally considered as most laborious. Though he by no means neglected the writers of Greece and Rome, yet he employed the greater portion of his time in studying the writings of the Fathers, making himself intimately acquainted with their opinions and doctrines, as well as fully able both to explain and to defend their interpretation of difficult or disputed passages of Scripture. With what earnestness he devoted his mind to these abstruse inquiries, he had an early opportunity of giving an honourable testimony, which will presently be mentioned more at large.

He took the degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1688; and on the 1st of July, 1689, was elected a Fellow of the before-mentioned College;

[1] [London, 1829. ED.]

and his election to that fellowship was attended with some flattering marks of distinction. On the 23rd of June, 1691, he took the degree of Master of Arts, and was appointed one of the tutors of the College [2]. In that situation he paid particular attention to the instruction of a young man, whom he had brought from Wakefield and introduced at the University, and who, soon after Mr. Bingham's election to a fellowship, was by his means chosen scholar of the same foundation to which he himself belonged. This was Mr. John Potter [3], who afterwards became Archbishop of Canterbury. Mr. Potter's first tutor happening to die when he was no more than two years' standing in the University, Mr. Bingham took his young friend and townsman under his own wing; and to his having given some general directions to his studies, which it is probable therefore would have a similarity to those he pursued himself, it is reasonable to suppose we owe that excellent book, *Potter on Church Government*, and perhaps also *Potter's Antiquities of Greece.*

About four years after Mr. Bingham had taken his Master's degree, a circumstance occurred which eventually occasioned him to leave the University. At that time controversies ran high among learned men concerning the true explanation of the Trinity, the manner in which that doctrine had been understood or maintained by the primitive Fathers, and what they meant by *Οὐσία* and *Substantia.* Mr. Bingham being called on in his turn, as a Master of Arts, to preach before the learned body of which he was a member, and having heard what he conceived to be a very erroneous statement on that subject, delivered by a leading man from the pulpit at St. Mary's, thought it his duty not to let the occasion, which then offered, escape him of evincing publicly his intimate acquaintance with the opinions and doctrines of the Fathers, and of displaying at the same time the zeal and perseverance with which he was resolved to defend their tenets concerning the Trinity, in opposition to the unjust attacks of men, who, though inferior to him in learning, were

2 For these particulars and many others in this relation, I was some years ago indebted to the condescending attention of Dr. Wetherell, the late Master of University College, Oxford; who in the most obliging manner took the trouble of examining the records of his College, and other documents in the University, and from thence gave me much assistance and information.

3 [He matriculated at Oxford in the year 1688, and became a Scholar of University, I believe, in 1690. He was elected a Fellow of Lincoln in 1694. In 1704 Mr. Potter was appointed Chaplain to Archbishop Tenison. He was made Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford in 1708, was consecrated Bishop of Oxford in 1715, and finally translated to Canterbury in 1737. He died ten years afterwards in 1747. Ed.]

in much more elevated stations than that which he filled. In pursuance of this determination, he delivered a long and learned discourse in the University Church on the 28th of October, 1695, taking for his text those words of the Apostle, "There are three that bear record in heaven: the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one."

This sermon, though containing nothing more than an elaborate exposition and defence of what the Fathers had asserted to be the true, ancient, and ecclesiastical notion of the term *person*, in opposition to what he deemed the novel and heterodox explanation of it, which he had lately heard given, drew on the learned preacher a very heavy censure from the ruling members of the University, charging him with having asserted doctrines false, impious, and heretical, contrary and dissonant to those of the Catholic Church. This censure[4] was followed by other charges in the public prints; wherein he was accused of Arianism, Tritheism, and the heresy of Valentinus Gentilis. These matters ran so high, and the party against him was so powerful, that he found himself under the necessity of resigning his fellowship on the 23rd of November, 1695, and of withdrawing from the University. How wholly unmerited these accusations were, not only appears from the Sermon itself, now in my possession, and which it is my intention to publish in the last volume of this edition[5], but also from the whole tenour of his life and writings, in both and all of which he constantly proved himself to be a zealous and devout defender of what is called the orthodox notion of the Trinity.

[4] That such a censure was passed, by means of the commanding influence in the University of the preceding preacher, is most certain, no less from domestic tradition of the circumstance, than from the mention which is repeatedly made of it in the manuscript papers of our Author. But I am assured that no traces thereof are now to be found in the books of the University.

[In the Life of Anthony à Wood, prefixed to the Athenæ Oxonienses, (p. 123. of Bliss's edition,) there is a note containing Mr. Tanner's Letter to Dr. Charlett concerning Mr. Wood's last illness, &c. After the account of Wood, Tanner says, 'The meeting about Mr. Bingham is to-morrow morning at nine of the clock.' Now this Letter is dated All Souls Coll. Oxon. Nov. 24, 1695, the very day after my Ancestor resigned his fellowship, yielding, it would seem, to a party at that moment too powerful for him, and disgusted as he well might be at opposition and rebuke, which he of all men so little deserved. The absence of all trace of the censure against him is also a very fair criterion of the real opinion of the University, however he may have suffered temporarily through the prejudices of partizans. See also note 9, following. Ed.]

[5] [Reprinted in the tenth volume of the present edition with the two Visitation-Sermons of 1696 and 97. Ed.]

Immediately on the resignation of his fellowship, Mr. Bingham was presented, without any solicitation on his part, by the famous Dr. Radcliffe, one of the most liberal benefactors to the University of Oxford, to the rectory of Headbourn-Worthy, a living valued at that time at about one hundred pounds a year, and situated at a little more than a mile from Winchester. Within a few months after his settling in the country, being called on to preach at a visitation, held on the 12th of May, 1696, in Winchester Cathedral, he seized that opportunity of pursuing the subject which he had begun at Oxford, and of exculpating himself from those heavy charges which had been so unjustly brought against him; and which, according to his own words, 'if true, were enough to give all wise and sober men a just abhorrence of any one who had merited them.' That my revered Ancestor had in no degree deserved those imputations in the opinion of his brethren before whom he preached, may by the strongest deductions of reason be concluded from his having, at no greater distance of time than the 16th of September, 1697, been again appointed to preach before them on a similar occasion. He then brought to a conclusion what he wished to say further on that subject, his manner of treating which had exposed him to the censure of the University; and having done so, he prepared to commit the three Sermons to the press. Why this intention was not fulfilled, I cannot discover from any of his papers; but on the other hand I find among them a long Preface to the Sermon preached at Oxford, explaining and justifying his motives both for having preached and published it; and a second Preface annexed to the first of those preached at Winchester, in which he dedicates the two Visitation-Sermons to the clergy of the deanery before whom they were delivered; and therein he tells them that he has been induced to do so, not only from the subject contained in them being such as was their immediate concern, but also that he might have an opportunity of giving a more full account of the motive and circumstances which had occasioned him to write or publish them. These Prefaces contain also very long and learned additional statements corroborative of what Mr. Bingham had in his Sermons asserted concerning the opinions of the Fathers. But as it is my intention to publish the whole of these Sermons, with the Prefaces of the writer, in the concluding volume of this edition[6], it would be useless to enter here into any further comment or explanation respecting them.

Thus much, however, it has appeared to me proper to say, in the commencement of the biographical account of this eminent divine,

[6] [The tenth volume of the present. Ed.]

lest a censure of any sort, though every trace of it is now expunged from their records, having been passed by those who were at that time leading characters in a great and learned University[7], might at first view be considered as a blot in the character of one who, not only by the still-existing testimony of all his writings, but also by every account which has been handed down from his parishioners, or his own immediate family, was both in his private life, and in his literary pursuits, in his morality, disposition, and religious tenets, irreproachable and exemplary.

About six years after our Author had taken up his residence at Worthy, he married Dorothea, one of the daughters of the Rev. Richard Pococke[8], at that time Rector of Colmere, in Hampshire. By this lady, in the course of a few years, and before he had any other preferment than the small living above-mentioned, he became the father of ten children, two sons and eight daughters. Yet neither did he suffer the rapid increase of his family, nor the consequent narrowness of his finances, to depress his spirits, or impede the progress of his studies. On the contrary, he appears to have applied to his literary pursuits with a closer and more persevering industry; and by those means, in the course of what cannot be considered as a long life, he was enabled to complete in his country retirement, besides several other single volumes[9], the following learned and laborious work,—ORIGINES ECCLESIASTICÆ,—the first volume of which he published in 1708, [and the second in 1709[10];]

Refer to ye contents bound in one vol. of E. 1712, 2

7 [It does not seem clear to me that any public censure of Convocation, or in any way officially and authoritatively, was ever passed or recorded against my Ancestor at all. Had that been the case, there would surely be forthcoming some vestige of it, or some statement of its having been some other day rescinded. I apprehend that party spirit in high places running strong against him, he willingly retired, disgusted by the unjust opposition he met with, and preferring the unmolested pursuit of his favourite studies in the country to the warfare of academical polemics and the painfulness of frequent personal intercourse with influential partizans, whom he could not persuade, much less control. His voluntary retirement may have induced his opponents to withhold the threatened censure. ED.]

8 Grandfather of the Right Rev. Richard Pococke, Bishop of Ossory [in 1756, and translated to Meath in 1765,] author of *The Description of the East, &c.*

9 [The French Church's Apology for the Church of England, in 1706; the First Part of the Scholastical History of Baptism by Laymen, &c., in 1712; the Second Part of the same in 1714; and the Dissertation on the Eighth Nicene Canon, by way of rejoinder to Mr. Lawrence's *Supplement*, after the expiration of the year 1715 and before 1719, the dates of the fourth and fifth volumes o the *Origines* respectively. ED.]

10 [These two were reprinted in 1710. Volume the third came out in 1711,

and it pleased Providence to spare his life till he had brought his useful and arduous undertaking to a perfect and full conclusion. He committed the tenth and last volume to the press in 1722, and died in August, 1723.

Of the great difficulties with which my learned Progenitor had to contend in the prosecution of his labours, he speaks in several parts of his works in such pointed terms, as cannot but excite both our sympathy and regret. He had to struggle, he tells us, with an infirm and sickly constitution, and constantly laboured under the greatest disadvantages for want of many necessary books, which he had no opportunity to see, and no ability to purchase. At the same time he does not omit to express his gratitude to Providence, which had so placed him that he could have recourse to a very excellent library [11], though even that was deficient in many works to which he had occasion to refer. Yet, when we turn to the *Index Auctorum* at the end of his great work, we shall perhaps be astonished at the vast number of writers, [between eight and nine hundred,] which he appears to have consulted.

That he was greatly distressed for books, we learn from his own words, as above stated. A circumstance, however, more expressive of this fact than any assertion can possibly be, deserves to be mentioned in this place, because it furnishes rather a singular, and certainly very striking proof, of the confined circumstances, and his consequent inability to purchase books, under which this good and learned divine continually laboured. I have in my possession a folio edition of Dr. Pearson's Exposition of the Creed, [London, 1669,] which belonged, in a torn and imperfect state, to the author of ORIGINES ECCLESIASTICÆ, and has had what was deficient in it restored by him with much care and trouble. It contains eight whole pages, most neatly and accurately transcribed with his own

in 1715 the fourth was published, the fifth and sixth followed in 1719, the seventh and eighth in 1720, and in 1722 the ninth and tenth. Thus the old octavo set in ten volumes, which is commonly regarded as the only edition before the folio of 1726, is in fact the second edition or reprint of the first two volumes and the *editio princeps* of all the rest. I possess all these, as well as the original editions of the French Church's Apology and of the First and Second Parts of the Scholastical History of Baptism by Laymen; but I have never been able to procure a copy of the original edition of the Dissertation on the Eighth Nicene Canon, or of the Sermon on the Mercy of God. ED.]

11 The library of the Cathedral Church at Winchester, being a very valuable collection bequeathed to the Dean and Chapter of that Church by the renowned Bishop Morley, [who was translated from Worcester to Winchester in 1662,] for the use of the parochial clergy, and to promote their advancement in learning.

hand. Such was his great want of books, and the extreme narrowness of his circumstances, that he was reduced, we see, to the necessity of employing several hours of that time,—of which, comparatively speaking, so small a portion was allotted him, and which he could so ill spare from more intense and useful studies,—in the tedious and irksome task of transcribing many whole folio pages to supply the deficiences of a mutilated book, of which a complete copy might have been purchased for a few shillings.

In addition to the inconvenience he experienced for the want of books, the progress of his studies was much impeded, as indeed we have already mentioned, by the weakness and infirmities of his constitution. In the concluding page of the last volume of his ORIGINES [12], we find him lamenting the state of his health in the following words: 'Another book more of Miscellaneous Rites might be added; but having laboured in this work for twenty years, with frequent returns of bodily infirmities, which make hard study now less agreeable to a weakly constitution, and the things themselves being of no great moment, I rather choose to give the reader a complete and finished work with an Index to the whole, than, by grasping at too much, to be forced to leave it imperfect, neither to my own nor the world's satisfaction.'

Nor were these the only discouraging circumstances with which this worthy man had to contend. He was surrounded, as we have already mentioned, with a family of ten children, and met with a very late and small patronage to reward him for his great literary labours, or to enable him to pursue them with comfort or convenience. He had, it is true, on his leaving Oxford, been presented by Dr. Radcliffe to the small living of Headbourn-Worthy. But neither did his great learning, nor his other excellent qualifications as a divine, obtain him any other preferment for many years. At length, in 1712, Sir Jonathan Trelawney, [Baronet,] at that time Bishop of Winchester, collated him to the Rectory of Havant, a few miles from Portsmouth. In justice, however, to the memory of Dr. Charles Trimnell, the immediate successor of Sir Jonathan Trelawney, I ought not to omit mentioning, that it was the declared intention of that prelate to have nominated this learned divine to the first prebend which might become vacant in the Cathedral Church of Winchester. This intention, so honourable to his Lordship's discernment, and so strongly evincing his love of learning, was, if I may be allowed the expression, *doubly* prevented by death, as the bishop, having presided over the see of Winchester only two years, died on

[12] [According to this edition, b. 23. ch. 4. s. 9. v. 8. p. 186. ED.]

the same day on which it will be hereafter seen Mr. Bingham departed.

The possession of the living of Havant, together with the small sums which he was continually receiving from the sale of his works, seemed to have removed in some degree the narrowness of his circumstances. But this pleasing prospect, in the course of a few years, wholly disappeared: for just as he had realized, by the sale of his learned works, a sum sufficient to remove any uneasiness from his mind respecting the maintenance of his widow and numerous family in the event of his decease, it pleased Providence to put his Christian resignation to a severe trial, by depriving him at one blow of all the profits which he had reaped from the incessant toil and study, to which more than half his life had been devoted. Nearly, if not quite the whole, of these hardly-earned gains was suddenly torn from him in 1720, by what was then metaphorically termed the bursting of the South Sea Bubble. Yet such was the tranquillity of his disposition, such his piety and resignation, that this heavy loss did not appear to make the smallest impression on him, or for a single day to interrupt his important studies. I have the evidence of his own manuscripts[13] to prove that he pursued his valuable literary labours with unchanged and indefatigable zeal, and almost without intermission, to the very close of his existence. Though only a few months elapsed between the publication of the last volume of ORIGINES ECCLESIASTICÆ and his death, yet in the course of that short time he not only proposed to himself, but had actually prepared materials for the prosecution of several other useful and laborious works.

We find him, in the Preface to his last two volumes[14], recommending to any young men of learning and application, who might have opportunity of examining books, the writing of several works, which he conceived would conduce to the improvement of ecclesiastical knowledge; and the only objection which could be offered against such undertakings, he thought himself an example sufficient to confute. 'The great objection against all these things is,' he ob-

[13] [Consisting chiefly, as I find, of parochial sermons and skeletons of sermons. There is also a volume of translations of several of the most remarkable Homilies of St. Chrysostome, some brief controversial pieces, a series of extracts from the Annals of Spondanus, and some extracts and memoranda of striking instances in ecclesiastical history. ED.]

[14] [In the present edition of the Whole Works this Preface will be found reproduced in its proper order among other *Prolegomena*, which I have thought it best to prefix to this, the first, volume of my edition. ED.]

serves, 'that each of them is too great an undertaking for any single person. I remember to have heard of the same objection made by some against me and my ORIGINES, upon publishing the first volume of them. I bless God I have lived to confute the objection, and give the world a proof that great and laborious works are not always so frightful as sometimes they are imagined. I have given a little specimen of what the industry of a single person may do, in whom there is neither the greatest capacity nor the strongest constitution. And, having made the experiment myself, I can with more decency and freedom recommend these things to others, who are qualified to undertake them.' In the same Preface he promises, if God should be pleased to give him better health, to endeavour to effect some of those works himself. And accordingly, among his manuscript papers, there are many collections[15] relative to those important subjects.

His chief attention, however, during the short remainder of his life, appears to have been directed towards making preparations for a new edition of his ORIGINES. With this view he inserted many manuscript observations, and additional notes[16], in a set of his ANTIQUITIES[17], which he preserved for his own use, from which the present edition of his works [1829] is in the course of publication. But from fulfilling this intention, and all other employments, he was prevented by death. His constitution, which was naturally extremely weak and delicate, could not be otherwise than much impaired by such a persevering and unremitted course of laborious studies, and by a life, in consequence of those studies, wholly recluse and sedentary. These circumstances combined brought upon him, at comparatively an early period of life, all the symptoms and infirmities of very advanced age. So much indeed was his whole system decayed for some considerable time before he died, that his dissolution at no very distant period being clearly foreseen, both by himself and friends, it was settled between the then Bishop of

15 [The manuscripts alluded to (see n. 13, preceding,) are scarcely of a character to justify this remark, though in themselves they are somewhat interesting. Possibly I may yet find an opportunity of publishing them as *Brief Remains of the Learned Joseph Bingham.* ED.]

16 [Most of these, which were first published in my Father's edition of 1829, are merely *additional references.* Taking them up as I found them, I have given *in extenso* the citations, which respectively belong to them; and have marked them, together with other additions and explanations of my own, by angular brackets, which designate all interpolations and corrections. ED.]

17 [Between 1710 and 1722. See before, p. 21, and n. 10, preceding. ED.]

Winchester, Dr. Charles Trimnell [18], and himself, that he should resign Havant, to enable his Lordship to appoint some friend of the family to hold it till his eldest son, then about twenty years of age, could be collated to it. As this, however, was not carried into execution, it is probable, that both the bishop's and his own death came on more hastily than had been expected.

After a life thus spent in honourable and useful pursuits, this learned and devout divine died on the 17th of August, 1723, it may be truly said, of old age, though he was then only in his fifty-fifth year. His body was buried in the churchyard of Headbourn-Worthy; but, as he frequently expressed a dislike to monuments and pompous inscriptions, nothing was erected to his memory, except a plain tomb over his grave; and on the slab, which covers it, his name and age and the year of his death were mentioned. A devout and scrupulous adherence to the well-known wishes of his departed parent prevented his eldest son, who afterwards became rector of Havant, from putting up a monument to his father's memory, as he had at one time intended, with the following inscription:

Obstupesce, Viator!
Venerandi hic conduntur Cineres
Josephi Bingham, A.M.
Nati Wakefeldiæ apud Eboracenses,
Collegii Universitatis apud Oxonienses quondam Socii:
Cujus multiplicem si spectes Doctrinam,
Quam Scriptis prodidit,
Si exactam Veteris Disciplinæ et
Consuetudinum Ecclesiasticarum Notitiam,
Cyprianica ætate vel etiam Ignatiana,
Moribus quoque primævis,
Vixisse agnoscas,
Nisi quod non esset Episcopus.
At, væ Sæculo Meritorum immemori et ingrato!
Cum, qui Patriarchatum in Ecclesia meruit,
Nonnisi Headbourn-Worthy et Havanti, in Agro Hantoniensi,
Parochus obiit,
Decimo Septimo die Augusti,
Anno Christi 1723, Ætatis 55.

This was written and sent with a letter of condolence to the family of the deceased by the same Mr. Edward Clarke, who had been his first instructor at the school in Wakefield; and who, through his whole life, maintained an intimate friendship with him, and continued to cultivate the highest regard for his memory.

[18] [Translated from Norwich to Winchester in 1721. He died in 1723. Ed.]

At the time of my learned ancestor's decease, only six of his ten children, two sons and four daughters, were living; who, with their widowed mother, were left in very contracted circumstances. Mrs. Bingham was therefore induced to sell the copyright of her late husband's writings to the booksellers, who immediately published the whole of his works, which had appeared in print, in two volumes folio, without making any alterations; and though the eldest son of the deceased undertook the office of correcting the press, he did not insert any of the manuscript additions or notes, which had been prepared. As he was then not quite twenty years of age, he probably had not had an opportunity of examining his father's books and papers sufficiently to discover that any such preparations for a new edition existed. Mr. Richard Bingham, the person on whom this task devolved, had been bred on the foundation at Winchester College, and from thence, by the nomination of the same Dr. Potter,—of whom we have already spoken, and who was at that time Regius Professor of Divinity and Canon of Christ Church [19],—he was appointed a student of that society. It having happened, as I before stated, that the Bishop of Winchester and Mr. Joseph Bingham died on the same day, the right of presentation to the living of Havant, therefore, lapsed to the Crown; and from thence, by the interest of friends, who properly estimated the merits of the deceased, it was obtained for a Mr. Baddeley, till the eldest son of the writer they so much valued should be of sufficient age to take it himself. Accordingly when Mr. Richard Bingham was in priest's orders, he was collated [or rather, instituted] to it by Bishop Willis [20], and acquitted himself in that situation, during an incumbency of thirty-seven years, as a man endowed with a strong and excellent understanding, and of the most exemplary honour, integrity, and virtue.

The widow died in 1755, at a very advanced age, in Bishop Warner's College for clergymen's widows at Bromley in Kent. Of the four daughters who survived their father, one married a gentleman of Hampshire, of the name of Mant, the grandfather of the present Bishop of Killaloe [21], and the other three died single.

19 [In 1708, and Bishop of Oxford in 1715. But my Ancestor did not marry till 1699 or 1700; consequently Dr. Potter must have been Bishop of Oxford ere Richard Bingham could have been old enough for eligibility to such a position. Dr. Potter was not translated to Canterbury till 1737. Ed.]

20 [Bishop of Gloucester in 1714, of Salisbury in 1721, and of Winchester, on Dr. Trimnell's death, in 1723. Ed.]

21 [Dr. Richard Mant, Fellow of Oriel, 1798. Consecrated Bishop of Killaloe

The second son of this eminent writer, who, after his father, bore the name of Joseph, was the youngest of the family, and consequently a child at the time of his father's death. Though he died in very early life, yet during the short period of his existence, he pursued his studies with such unremitting perseverance, and gave such early proofs of genius and sound understanding, and so strongly evinced his determination to tread in the footsteps of his father, as fully entitle him to hang, as it were, on the arm of his learned parent, and thus obtain a few lines from the pen of the biographer.

This young man received his education on the foundation at the Charter-house: from whence he was, at the usual age, removed to Corpus Christi College, in Oxford. In the University, he was a most exemplary and persevering student; and was preparing to give public proofs of his diligence, having actually printed every part, except the titlepage and preface, of the Theban Story [22]. Whilst he was thus usefully employed, and just as he was on the point of being ordained, with every prospect of promotion from the patronage of his father's former pupil, then Archbishop Potter, he was suddenly brought to his grave, at the immature age of twenty-two, through an illness wholly occasioned by too sedentary a life, and

and Kilfenora in 1820, and translated to Down and Connor in 1823. He died in 1849. He was Bishop of the former see when this Life was first written, but of the latter when it was prefixed to my Father's edition of the Works in 1829. Ed.]

22 This was completed and published after his death by a gentleman, into whose hands his papers had fallen, as a security for a sum of money which had been borrowed to facilitate the publication. [Dr. John Burton was a Scholar of Corpus Christi College at Oxford in the year 1713, and became one of the tutors there in due course. He was Fellow of Eton, and Vicar of Maple Durham, Oxfordshire, in 1733. Died, 1771. The work alluded to is well known under the name of Burton's Pentalogia, first published in Oxford in 1758, 8vo. In the Epistle Dedicatory prefixed to the book, Dr. Burton takes no notice of a fact well known to members of Joseph Bingham's family, while he pays the following brief tribute to the young man's memory: 'Editionis administrandæ cura juveni, quem inter pupillos præcipuum habueram, Josepho Bingham, erat commissa: supellectilis literariæ, quæ undequaque conquiri poterant, subsidia comparata: ipse, qua potui, aderam una hortator atque adjutor: et profecto de summa rerum præclara quædam non temere mihi polliceri videbar. At vero in medio operis instituti decursu spes nostras omnes subito intercisas destituit improvisa et præmatura mors; ille optimi et animi et ingenii juvenis febre præreptus triste sui desiderium bonis omnibus reliquit. Atque hæc adeo, quam moliebar, editio jam diu pendebat imperfecta, aliquando per intervalla temporum a me retractanda, et jam tandem amicorum opera succurrente ad finem perducta.' Ed.]

too close an application to his studies. His body lies buried in the cloisters of Corpus Christi College, without either monument, inscription, or stone erected to his memory[23], though it might be most truly said of him, that he fell a martyr to application, industry, and learning.

There is one further circumstance, which, as it is highly honourable to the learned person, the memoirs of whose life I have undertaken to write, it will not be deemed irrelevant to mention.

Of such importance have the works of this eminent writer been esteemed in foreign countries, that they have all, with the utmost correctness, been translated into Latin by a divine of a German University. Such an undertaking the Author himself strongly recommended to any person of industry and ability as a work, which would, he conceived, be highly useful to the Protestant Churches on the Continent. But this flattering mark of approbation he did not live to receive; for he died, as has been before stated, in 1723; and I find the first volume of his ORIGINES was published in Latin by Johannes Henricus Grischovius, at Halle, 1724[24].

Here I hope I may be allowed to observe, how frequently it occurs, and how encouraging it is to reflect, that the merits of an eminent ancestor are productive of honour or emolument to his posterity. It cannot be doubted, that the high literary attainments of my great-grandfather were the means of procuring the living of Havant for his eldest son; and a late learned and excellent Bishop of London, Dr. Robert Lowth[25], expressly assigned that reason for bestowing a living of moderate value [Runwell, near Rayleigh, in

23 [A desideratum to the present day. However, this mention of him will haply prove a better and more lasting memorial than brass or marble. ED.]

24 This well known Latin Version was originally issued in ten small quarto volumes, between the years 1724 and 1729, forming five tomes: an eleventh volume or sixth tome was afterwards published in 1738, containing the Lay-Baptism, the Dissertation on the Eighth Nicene Canon, the French Church's Apology, and the Discourse on the Mercy of God. Grischovius first printed nearly all the quotations *in extenso*, referring for the most part to copies of editions of the same dates respectively as those which my learned Ancestor consulted. To him indeed, I am myself, in common with some other editors, much indebted: but it will be observed, that I have discovered and put into their proper places the passages belonging to several references, which Grischovius either could not find, or considered indistinct or erroneous, and marked with a dagger accordingly. The Latin Prefaces of Grischovius and Buddeus to the ORIGINES are prefixed, for reasons of convenience, to the second volume of this edition of the Whole Works. ED.]

25 [Bishop of St. David's in 1766, translated to Oxford in the same year, and to London in 1777. Died, 1787. ED.]

Essex,] on his grandson. 'I venerate,' says he, in a letter which conveyed the presentation to my father, the Rev. I. M. Bingham, 'I venerate the memory of your excellent grandfather, my father's particular and most intimate friend. He was not rewarded as he ought to have been: I therefore give you this living as a small recompense for his great and inestimable merits.'

I cannot, perhaps, better conclude this account, than by endeavouring to give, in few words, the general character of this worthy divine.

His constitution, as we have before had occasion to remark, was extremely weak and sickly; yet, that his industry was unbounded and his application most indefatigable, his published works alone are abundantly sufficient to testify, without any mention being made of the very numerous manuscript papers which he left behind him at his death. These consisted principally of exhortations and discourses, which he had preached to his parishioners. For, eagerly and even zealously as he pursued his studies, he never suffered his love for them to interrupt, or make him negligent in the performance of, his parochial duties. His disposition was of the mildest and purest cast; nor was it ever ruffled by the common accidents or occurrences of life. So wholly indeed was he absorbed in the pursuit of knowledge, that he appears to have been above being disturbed by any concerns of a worldly nature. I have before observed, and it may here be repeated as the strongest proof, that this is not merely the gratuitous assertion of an over-partial biographer, that when he lost at one blow [in 1720] the whole hard-earned profits of a laborious life, it never, even for a moment, so deeply affected him as to interrupt the progress of his studies. All arrangements, any ways relating to domestic or pecuniary matters, were left wholly in the hands of his wife and friends. Scarcely ever indeed did he for a single hour relax from his literary labours, except to fulfil those duties which his situation as a parochial pastor called on him to perform.

As a husband and father, he was of a kind and affectionate deportment. The duties of his profession he punctually discharged, not only with great ability, but with devout and fervent zeal, directed by pious and conscientious rectitude. As a writer, his learning was deep and extensive; his style zealous, strong, energetic, and convincing; and his application, in no common degree, persevering and unwearied. Yet to a temper mild, humane, charitable, and benevolent, on all common and indifferent occasions, he united a zeal and fervour, in the cause of learning and of truth, which no

names or authorities however great could awe him to relinquish; no infirmity of body or constitution could deter him from pursuing; and which no obstacle, disappointment, or opposition, could diminish or impede. Though his passions were so wholly subject to the guidance of religion and of virtue, that no worldly losses were sufficient to ruffle or disturb him; yet, whenever he believed the important interests of Christianity, or the true faith in any of its essential doctrines, to be in danger, he was always ready, and even eager, to step forth in their defence. So free, unshackled, and disinterested was his mind, that, according to his own words, 'though he loved not to enter into dispute with any man, yet he did not think great names so venerable as to be of sufficient authority to lead others by their dictates only, especially in matters of faith and history, unless they assign just grounds for their assertions.'

RICHARD BINGHAM, [THE ELDER.]

Gosport, 1829.

P.S. It may perhaps be observed, that much of the language used in the preceding account is the same as is to be found in the Life of the Author, published some few years since in the Biographical Dictionary. Though one of the *Editors* of that work has acknowledged the assistance I gave him by furnishing that article, only in a note, saying, 'From *materials* communicated by the Rev. Richard Bingham, &c. &c.,' the fact is, I wrote at his request the whole of the article, together with much other matter which he thought fit to omit; and I have at this moment the manuscript which I lent him for the purpose of its being inserted in his work. I have, therefore, freely used my own language and expression, which I could not very easily avoid.

III.

ORIGINAL LETTERS,

[EXTRACTED FROM A PUBLICATION IN 3 VOLS. 8VO. BY JOHN AUBREY, ESQ. ENTITLED "LETTERS WRITTEN BY EMINENT PERSONS OF THE 17TH AND 18TH CENTURIES."]

From the Rev. Joseph Bingham to the Rev. Dr. Charlett, Master of University College, Oxford.

Honoured Sir,

Having this opportunity, I could not but lay hold of it to return you my thanks for your last remembrance of me from London. Sir P. Sydenham [26] called upon me in his journey, and bought some books of me at Winton, where I have lately disposed of Dr. Sayer's [27] study among friends, finding it as profitable to sell books as to write them, though I have made shift to send another volume [28] now to the press. Mr. Sone desired me to recommend the bearer to your favour to be Bible Clerk the next vacancy, assuring me that he was both a sober youth and a tolerably good scholar; and, if you have not disposed of the place, I should be glad to hear that you think him worthy of an office which contributed in part to my own education.

We expect two new members for the county, Sir Simeon Stuart and Mr. Pitt, who are in the poll 400 or 500 voters before their competitors here at Winton; and it is supposed they will rather gain than lose in the Isle of Wight. This is all the present news this place affords.

26 [Sir Philip Sydenham was the second son of Sir John, (the first Baronet of the name, July 28, 1641, descended from the Sydenhams of Brimpton, in Somersetshire,) by his second wife, Lady Mary Herbert, daughter of Philip, Earl of Pembroke. At the time alluded to in this Letter, Sir Philip was M. P. for Ilchester. See the English Baronets, Lond. 1727. vol. 1. p. 424. ED.]

27 [Dr. Thomas Sayer was installed a Prebendary of Winchester in 1700. (See the History and Antiquities of Winchester, Winton, 1773, vol. 2. p. 275.) I presume my Ancestor discharged, in 1710, the duties of an executor in disposing of the Doctor's library, as intimated above. ED.]

28 [I apprehend he alluded to the third volume of the ORIGINES. See the next note following. ED.]

I would have had my bookseller to have printed a little set of maps of Ecclesiastical Geography, about ten or twelve, to have gone along with my next Books [29]; but he is not willing to venture upon it without assurance of subscriptions, or the like: so I must let it drop; which I am sorry for, because I take it to be an useful thing for all that read ancient Church-history.

I am, with all due respects, your obliged friend and servant,

J. BINGHAM.

All Saints' Day, 1710.

From the Same to the Same.

Honoured Sir,

I sent you the Second Part of the Scholast. Hist. of Lay Baptism, which I desire you to accept as a testimony of my respect, though the subject should happen to be disagreeable to your opinion. I still preserve my old friends and their favour, the Bishop of Rochester, &c. [30], though we differ in our sentiments upon this point; and though I meet with some rebukes, as you find in the Preface, from rude persons; yet they are trifles to me, who am conscious of nothing but defending the Church's practice.

My last journey to London proved very successful. I waited upon my Lord Treasurer [31], without any other introduction, but my book [32] in my hand. He received me very kindly, and invited me to dine with him the next day; when he surprised me before dinner with a present of a bank-bill of 100*l.*, as an encouragement to go on with the Antiquities of the Church, with which he expresses himself very much pleased. I believe I am obliged to the kind offices of Dr. Arbuthnot [33], who has been very friendly in recom-

29 [The third volume published in 1711, containing the seventh, eighth, and ninth Books, and with the maps and plans; whence it appears that subsequently to this letter my Ancestor must have come to the wished-for arrangement with his publisher. These maps and plans are reproduced at the end of the third volume of this Edition. Ed.]

30 [Dr. Francis Atterbury, who had been Dean of Christ Church from 1711 till he was consecrated to the see of Rochester before the latter part of 1713. Ed.]

31 Lord Treasurer Harley, created, in the reign of Queen Anne, Baron Wigmore and Earl of Oxford and Mortimer.

32 [Probably the first three volumes of the Origines. Ed.]

33 [The celebrated John Arbuthnot, M.D., an eminent wit as well as physician during the reign of Queen Anne. He succeeded to Dr. Hannes in 1709 as Physician in ordinary to her Majesty. He died in 1734. Ed.]

mending me to my Lord upon his personal acquaintance; and I beg of you, when you see him next, to give him thanks in my name for his kind remembrance of me. I desire you also to give my service to the Dean of Christ Church [34], and Dr. Potter [35], when you see them. My respects to all the Society.

I am your affectionate friend and humble servant,

JOS. BINGHAM.

Winton, Nov. 9, 1713 [36].

From the Same to the Same.

Honoured Sir,

I happened the other day to see Dr. Radcliffe's Picture, engraved by M. Burgher, where, among other things, I found the rectory of King's Worthy mentioned, as given to Univ. Coll. I was much surprised at the mistake, because that is another parish in which the Doctor had no concern; for the patronage belongs to my Lady Russel. The Doctor's will has it right, as I remember, Headborn-Worthy, al. Mortimer Worthy. And so it is called in the Valor. Mortimer Worthy, and distinguished from Worthy-Regis and Worthy-Martyris, which are different parishes [37]. There is also Abbot's Worthy, but that is only a tithing belonging to King's Worthy. The common name of our Parish is Headborn-Worthy; and so

[34] [Dr. George Smalridge, who succeeded to the Deanery of Christ Church, upon the promotion of Dean Atterbury to the bishopric of Rochester, which took place some little time before the date of this Letter. In 1714 Dr. Smalridge was also consecrated to the see of Bristol. Ed.]

[35] [At that time Regius Professor of Divinity. Ed.]

[36] [The first clause of the Letter implies that Joseph Bingham *had sent* the Second Part of his Lay-Baptism to Dr. Charlett before this date; yet the date on the titlepage of the original edition of that treatise is 1714. I conceive that either this date is inaccurate, or that the Tract was in the press or nearly finished before Nov. the 9th 1713, and that the Author had given directions to his publisher, Knaplock, to forward a copy from London to Oxford, and then wrote to Dr. C., under the impression that the book was gone. Yet I am more disposed to read 1714 for 1713; when I reflect that the First Part of Lay-Baptism appeared in 1712, then Mr. Lawrence's Second Part, in reply, came out in 1713, and it is hardly likely that my Ancestor would have produced his answer in the same year: or, if he did do so, possibly the pamphlet did not come actually before the public till the commencement of 1714. Ed.]

[37] [Kings-Worthy is in private patronage, and Martyr-Worthy is in the gift of the Bishop of Winchester. Ed.]

I have always called it in the titlepage of my books, whenever I had occasion to mention it. I cannot but wonder the person who was employed in giving an account of the Doctor's benefactions, should make such a mistake against so many evidences, or at least should not consult you before it was printed, who could have better informed him.

We have lately had a very good benefactor die in this place, who was pleased to make me one of his executors in trust. He gives 15*l.* per annum to a charity school; 10*l.* per ann. for reading evening prayer at St. Lawrence Church, in this city; 75*l.* per ann. for augmentation of poor livings throughout the nation. And the care of all these is committed in trust to the Dean and Chapter of Winton, who are to keep the 75*l.* till it amounts, by four years' income, to the sum of 300*l.*, and then join it to the Queen's Bounty of 200*l.* to make a perpetual settlement upon each church. He has likewise given 200*l.* to Magdalen Hospital, near this place; 100*l.* to the poor of Aston in Derbyshire, and the remainder of his estate, after debts and legacies are paid, to the poor of Winton. He gave one of his servants 200*l.*, and to his two executors 50*l.* each. His name was Mr. Joseph Percival, once a Spanish merchant. He died worth about 6,000*l.*, and I think out of such a sum his benefactions are as considerable as most of those which the present age affords.

I thought this short account might not be unacceptable to you, and therefore I give you the trouble of reading it; who am your obliged friend and humble servant,

JOS. BINGHAM.

Winton, Oct. 11, 1715[38].

[38] The writer of the foregoing letters resided, during the period at which they were written, in the Close at Winchester, that he might the more conveniently have recourse to the Library of the Cathedral Church.

IV.

THE AUTHOR'S DEDICATION,

[PREFIXED TO THE FIRST VOLUME OF THE ORIGINAL EDITION OF 1708 AND THE REPRINT OF 1710.]

TO THE

RIGHT HON. AND RIGHT REV. FATHER IN GOD,

JONATHAN,

LORD BISHOP OF WINCHESTER,

AND PRELATE OF THE MOST NOBLE ORDER OF THE GARTER.

My Lord,

HAVING once determined with myself to make these collections public, I needed no long time to consider to whom I should first address and present them. They are, my Lord, the first-fruits of my labour under your Lordship's government and inspection: and I was willing to think, and do presume I did not think amiss, that your Lordship had a sort of title to the first-fruits of any of your clergy's labour; especially if the subject on which they were employed was suitable to their calling, and had any direct tendency to promote Christian knowledge in the world.

The subject of the present discourse being an essay upon the ancient usages and customs of the Primitive Church, and a particular account of the state of her clergy, is such as, being considered barely in its own nature, I know cannot but be approved by a person of your Lordship's character; whose care is concerned not only in preserving the purity of the primitive faith, but also in

reviving the spirit of the ancient discipline and primitive practice; and were the management any ways answerable to the greatness of the subject, that would doubly recommend it to your Lordship's favour; since "apples of gold" are something the more beautiful for being set "in pictures of silver." But I am sensible the subject is too sublime and copious, too nice and difficult, to have justice done it from any single hand, much less from mine. All therefore I can pretend to hope for from your Lordship is, that your candour and goodness will make just allowances for the failings, which your sagacity and quickness will easily perceive to be in this performance.

I am not, I confess, without hopes, that as well the abstruseness and difficulty of the subject itself, as my own difficult circumstances, under which I was forced to labour, for want of proper assistance of abundance of books, may be some apology for the defects of the work; and if I can but so far obtain your Lordship's good opinion, as to be thought to have designed well; as I am already conscious of my own good intentions to consecrate all my labours to the public service of the Church; that will inspire me with fresh vigour, notwithstanding these difficulties, to proceed with cheerfulness and alacrity in the remaining parts of this work, which are yet behind, and which I shall be the more willing to set about, if I can perceive that it has your Lordship's approbation.

The countenance and encouragement of such a judge may perhaps have a more universal influence, to excite the zeal of many others, who have greater abilities to serve the Church; and I know not how better to congratulate your Lordship upon your happy accession to the episcopal throne of this diocese than by wishing you the blessing and satisfaction of such a clergy, whose learning and industry, and piety and religion, influenced by the wisdom of your conduct, and animated by the example of your zeal and perseverance, even to imprisonment in times of greatest difficulty[1], may so qualify

[1] [Sir Jonathan Trelawney, who was translated to Winchester June 14th, 1707, when presiding over the see of Bristol was one of the Seven Bishops committed to the Tower in the fourth year of King James II, anno Domini 1688. His portrait may be seen at Christ Church, Oxford, where he was educated. He was a younger son of Sir Jonathan Trelawney of Pelynt in Cornwall; but his elder brother dying he inherited the baronetcy. He is described as a man of polite manners, competent learning, and uncommon knowledge of the world. He was a true son and friend of the Church, and exerted himself with courage and alacrity, with magnanimity and address, in defence of her just rights and privileges. He was friendly and open, generous and charitable; was a good companion and a good man. He was successively bishop of Bristol, Exeter and Winchester. He had as much personal intrepidity as his predecessor in the last of these sees,

them to discharge every office of their function, as may make your diocese one of the shining glories of the present Church, and a provoking example to the future; which is the hearty prayer and desire of,

My Lord,

Your Lordship's faithful

and obedient servant,

[1708.] J. BINGHAM.

(Bishop Mews,) and was in all other respects much his superior. The masterly dedication before Dr. Atterbury's Sermons is addressed to this prelate. The reader may see in it some traits of his character without the exaggerations which are too often found in compositions of this kind; and which bring the sincerity of authors in question before we have read the first page of their works. ED.]

V.

THE AUTHOR'S PREFACE

TO THE

FIRST VOLUME,

AS ORIGINALLY PUBLISHED,

[1708, AND REPRINTED IN 1710.]

THIS volume which is now published being only a part of a larger work, the reader, I presume, will expect I should give him some little account of the whole design, and the reasons which engaged me upon this undertaking.

The design, which I have formed to myself, is to give such a methodical account of the Antiquities of the Christian Church, as others have done of the Greek, and Roman, and Jewish Antiquities; not by writing an historical, or continued chronological account of all transactions as they happened in the Church, of which kind of books there is no great want, but by reducing the ancient customs, usages, and practices of the Church under certain proper heads, whereby the reader may take a view at once of any particular usage or custom of Christians, for four or five of the first centuries, to which I have generally confined my inquiries in this discourse.

I cannot but own, I was moved with a sort of emulation, not an unholy one, I hope, to see so many learned men with so much zeal employed in collecting and publishing the Antiquities of Greece and Rome; whilst in the meantime we had nothing, so far as I was able to learn, that could be called a complete collection of the

Antiquities of the Church, in the method that is now proposed. The compilers of Church-History, indeed, have taken notice of many things of this kind, as they pass along in the course of their history, as Baronius, and the Centuriators, and several others: but then the things lie scattered in so many places, in large volumes, that there are few readers of those few that enter upon reading those books, that will be at the pains to collect their accounts of things into one view, or digest and methodize their scattered observations.

There are a great many other authors, who have written several excellent discourses upon particular subjects of Church-Antiquity, out of which, perhaps, a Gronovius or a Grævius might make a more noble collection of antiquities than any yet extant in the world: but as no one has yet attempted such a work, so neither, when it was effected, would it be for the purchase or perusal of every ordinary reader, for whose use chiefly my own collections are intended.

There are a third sort of writers, who have also done very good service in explaining and illustrating several parts of Church-Antiquity, in their occasional notes and observations upon many of the ancient writers; of which kind are the curious observations of Albaspiny, Justellus, Petavius, Valesius, Cotelerius, Baluzius, Sirmondus, Gothofred, Fabrotus, Bishop Beveridge, and many others, who have published the works of the ancient Fathers, and Canons of the Councils, with very excellent and judicious remarks upon them. But these again lie scattered in so many and so large volumes, without any other order than as the authors on whom they commented would admit of, that they are not to be reckoned upon, or used as any methodized or digested collection of Church-Antiquities, even by those who have ability to purchase, or opportunity to read them.

Besides these, there are another sort of writers who have purposely undertaken to give an account of the ancient usages of the Church, in treatises written particularly upon that subject; such as Gavantus, Casalius, Durantus, and several others of the Roman Communion: but these writers do by no means satisfy a judicious and inquisitive reader, for several reasons:—

1. Because their accounts are very imperfect, being confined chiefly to the liturgical part of the Church-Antiquity, beside which there are a great many other things necessary to be explained, which they do not so much as touch upon, or once mention.

2. Because in treating of that part they build much upon the collections of Gratian, and such modern[2] writers, and use the authority of the spurious epistles of the ancient Popes, which have been exploded long ago, as having no pretence to antiquity in the judgment of all candid and judicious writers. But chiefly their accounts are unsatisfactory, because,—

3. Their whole design is to varnish over the novel practices of the Romish Church, and put a face of antiquity upon them. To which purpose they many times represent ancient customs in disguise, to make them look like the practices of the present age, and offer them to the reader's view, not in their own native dress, but in the similitude and resemblance of modern customs.

Cardinal Bona himself[3] could not forbear making this reflection upon some such writers as these, whom he justly censures, as 'deserving very ill of the sacred rites of the Church, and their venerable antiquity; who measure all ancient customs by the practice of the present times, and judge of the primitive discipline only by the rule and customs of the age they live in; being deceived by a false persuasion, that the practice of the Church never differed in any point from the customs, which they learned from their forefathers and teachers, and which they have been inured to from their tender years. Whereas we retain many words in common with the ancient Fathers, but in a sense as different from theirs as our times are remote from the first ages after Christ; as will appear,' says he, 'when we come to discourse of the oblation, communion, and other parts of divine service.'

This is an ingenuous confession, and withal a just reflection upon the partiality of the writers of his own Church; and a good reason,

2 [Gratian's era was 1130. According to Bellarmine, 1140. Ed.]

3 Rer. Liturgic. l. 1. c. 18. n. 1. (Ed. Venet. 1764. p. 214.) De sacris ecclesiæ ritibus eorumque veneranda antiquitate illi procul dubio male merentur, qui, priscos mores præsentis temporis consuetudine metientes, omnem veterem disciplinam ad hujus ævi praxim expendunt, ea persuasione decepti, quod nihil unquam ab iis usibus diversum fuerit, quos a parentibus et præceptoribus didicerunt et quibus ab infantia assueverunt. Quod si priscorum Patrum monumenta evolvunt, quæ in illis obscura sunt obscuriora reddunt, veterem ecclesiam cum præsente comparantes; et, si forte in aliquid incidunt, quod ab hodiernis ritibus discrepet, subsistunt et nutant, vel inconsulto respuentes, vel falsa interpretatione in alienum sensum detorquentes quidquid a suis præjudicatis opinionibus abhorret ..... Multa quidem vocabula nobis et priscis Patribus communia retinemus, sed sensu ab eo, quem tunc habebat, non minus alieno, quam nostra tempora a primis post Christum sæculis remota sunt; ut palam fiet cum de oblatione, de communione, deque aliis partibus divini sacrificii, libro secundo disseremus.

in my opinion, why we are not to expect any exact accounts of Antiquity from any writers of that communion; though some are less tainted with her errors than others, and can allow themselves to be a little more liberal and free upon some occasions than the rest of their brethren. Yet even Bona himself, after the reflection he has made upon others, runs into the very same error, and falls under his own censure. And Habertus, though otherwise a very learned and ingenuous person, who has written about the Greek liturgies[4], as Bona has of the Latin, is often through prejudice carried away with the common failing of the writers of that side, whose talents are chiefly employed in palliating the faults of the communion and cause they are engaged in.

So that, if we are to expect any exact account of Church-Antiquities, it must be from some Protestant authors, who can write with greater freedom and less prejudice concerning the usages and customs of the Primitive Church. But among these there are very few that have travelled far in this way; the generality of our writers contenting themselves to collect and explain so much of Church-Antiquity as was necessary to shew the errors and novelties of Popery; but not descending to any more minute and particular consideration of things, which did not come within the compass of the controversy they had with the Romish Church.

Hospinian, indeed, in the beginning of the Reformation, wrote several large volumes of the Origin of Temples, Festivals, and Monachism, with the History of the Eucharist: but as these take in but a very few subjects, so they are too full of modern relations: which make them something tedious to an ordinary reader, and no complete account of primitive customs neither.

Spalatensis[5], in his books *De Republica Ecclesiastica*, has gone a little further; yet he generally confines himself to the Popish controversy, and has much out of Gratian and the Canon Law; which, indeed, served him as a good argument *ad hominem* against those whom he had to deal with[6], but it will not pass for authentic history in other cases.

4 [Archieraticon, sive Liber Pontificalis Ecclesiæ Græcæ, &c. Paris. 1643. sive Paris. 1676. fol. Ed.]

5 [Otherwise Marcus Antonius de Dominis, (Dominicy,) anno 1600. See the *Index Auctorum* to the Origines. v. 8. p. 245. Ed.]

6 [His book *De Republica, &c.*, was written against the Papal power after he forsook the Romish communion. (Vid. Ed. Londin. 1617.) He recanted in 1622, and perished three years afterwards in the dungeons of the Inquisition at Rome. Ed.]

Suicerus's *Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus* is abundantly more particular, and indeed the best treasure of this sort of learning that has yet been published: but his collections are chiefly out of the Greek Fathers; and only in the method of a vocabulary or lexicon, explaining words and things precisely in the order of the alphabet.

The most methodical account of things of this kind, that I have yet seen, is that of our learned countryman, Dr. Cave, in his excellent book of Primitive Christianity; wherein he has given a succinct, but clear account of many ancient customs and practices, not ordinarily to be met with elsewhere. But his design being chiefly to recommend the moral part of primitive Christianity to the observation and practice of men, he was not obliged to be very particular in explaining many other things, which, though useful in themselves, yet might be looked upon as foreign to his design; and for that reason, I presume, he industriously omitted them.

There are some other books, which I have not yet seen, but only guess by the titles that they may be of this kind; such as Bebelius's[7] *Antiquitates Ecclesiasticæ;* Martinay[8] *De Ritibus Ecclesiæ:* Hendecius[9] *De Antiquitatibus Ecclesiasticis,* Quenstedt's[10] *Antiquitates Biblicæ et Ecclesiasticæ.*

But I presume, whatever they are, they will not forestall my design, which is chiefly to gratify the English reader with an entire collection of Church-Antiquities in our own language, of which this volume[11] is published as a specimen: and, if this proves useful to

7 [The title of the work of Balthazar Bebelius alluded to is thus stated in the Bodleian Catalogue: *Antiquitates Ecclesiæ in tribus prioribus sæculis Evangelicæ et Hodiernæ ὁμοψήφου, quibusvis Heterodoxis oppositæ. Argentorati,* 1669. 4*to.* Ed.]

8 [Edmund Martené. A Benedictine, eminent for his scholarship in the latter part of the seventeenth century and the first part of the eighteenth. Born 1654, died 1739. The full title of the work alluded to is as follows: *De Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus, ex variis insigniorum Ecclesiarum Pontificalibus, Sacramentariis, Missalibus, &c., collecti atque exornati. Editio Secunda tertiam ultra partem aucta. Antwerp.* 1736–38. 4 *tom. fol.* For the contents of this liturgical work, as well as for an account of the other labours of this laborious compiler, see Darling's Cyclopædia Bibliographica, (col. 1981–88.) Lond. 1854. Ed.]

9 [Of this author and his work I can give no account. The name does not occur in Watt or Brunet, neither is it to be found in the Catalogues of the Bodleian or British Museum. The author is not noticed in the Biographie Universelle nor in any similar work that I have examined. Ed.]

10 [John Andrew. Professor of Theology in the University of Wittemberg. Died 1688. For a full account of his works consult Niceron's Mémoires, &c. Paris. 1729–45. 12mo. Ed.]

11 [Vol. I, containing the first and second Books. Lond. 1708. 8vo. Ed.]

the public, and finds a favourable acceptance, it will be followed by the remaining parts of the work, as my time and occasions will give me leave, according to the scheme here laid down, or with as little variation as may be. I shall next treat of the inferior orders of the clergy, as I have here done of the superior: then of the elections and ordinations of the clergy, and the several qualifications of those, that were to be ordained: of the privileges, immunities, and revenues of the clergy, and the several laws and rules which particularly respected their function[12]. To which I shall subjoin an account of the ancient ascetics, monks, virgins, and widows, who were a sort of retainers to the Church. After this shall follow an account of the ancient churches, and their several parts, utensils, consecrations, immunities, together with a *Notitia* of the ancient division of the Church into provinces, dioceses, parishes, and the original of these[13]. After which I shall speak of the service of the Church, beginning with the institution and instruction of the catechumens, and describing their several stages before baptism: then speak of baptism itself, and its ordinary concomitant, confirmation[14]. Then proceed to the other solemn services of psalmody, reading of the Scripture, and preaching, which were the first part of the ancient church-service; then speak of their prayers, and the several rites and customs observed therein; where, of the use of liturgies and the Lord's prayer; and of the prayers of catechumens, energumens, and penitents; all which part of the service thus far was commonly called by the name of the *Missa Catechumenorum;* then of the *Missa Fidelium*, or communion-service; where, of the manner of their oblations, and celebration of the eucharist, which was always the close of the ordinary church-service[15]. After this I shall proceed to give a particular account of their fasts[16] and festivals[17], their

12 [The contents of the fourth, fifth, and sixth Books forming the second volume, published originally in 1709, and reprinted, as well as the first volume, in 1710. Ed.]

13 [The subjects of the seventh, eighth, and ninth Books, forming the third volume, in two parts, originally published in 1711. Ed.]

14 [In the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth Books, constituting the fourth volume, and brought out in 1715. Ed.]

15 [In the fifth and sixth volumes, which both appeared in the course of 1719; the first of the two containing the thirteenth Book alone on the Liturgy generally, Set Forms, Habits, Gestures and Ceremonials; while the second was made up of the fourteenth Book on the *Missa Catechumenorum*, and the fifteenth on the *Missa Fidelium*. Ed.]

16 [Book 21, the second portion of the ninth volume in 1722. Ed.]

17 [Book 20, the first portion of that volume. Ed.]

marriage rites[18] and funeral rites[19], and the exercise of ancient church-discipline[20]; their manner of holding councils and synods, provincial, patriarchal, œcumenical; the power of Christian princes in councils, and out of them; the manner and use of their *Literæ Formatæ*[21], and the several sorts of them; their different ways of computation of time; to which I shall add an account of their schools, libraries, and methods of educating and training up persons for the ministry, and say something of the several translations of the Bible in use among them, and several other miscellaneous rites and things, which would properly come under none of the forementioned heads; such as, their manner of taking oaths, their abstinence from blood, their frequent use of the sign of the cross, their several sorts of public charities, the honours which they paid to their martyrs, together with an account of their sufferings, and the several instruments of cruelty used by the Heathen to harass and torment them.

In treating of all which, or any other such like matters as shall offer themselves, I shall observe the same method that I have done in this volume; illustrating the ancient customs from the original records of Antiquity, and joining the opinions of the best modern authors that I can have opportunity to peruse, for unfolding points of greatest difficulty. I confess, indeed, this work will suffer something in my hands for want of several books which I have no opportunity to see, nor ability to purchase; but that perhaps may tempt some others, who are at the fountains of learning, and have all manner of books at command, to add to my labours, and improve this essay to a much greater perfection; since it is a subject that will never be exhausted, but still be capable of additions and improvement.

The chief assistance I have hitherto had is from the noble benefaction of one who, being dead, yet speaketh. I mean the renowned

18 [Book 22, the last portion of that volume. Ed.]

19 [Book 23, the first part of the tenth volume, with Indices, &c., before the end of 1722. Ed.]

20 [The subject of the sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth Books; the first of these four forming vol. 7, and the other three vol. 8, both published during 1720. Ed.]

21 [See in Origines, b. 2, ch. 4, s. 5, and ibid. ch. 16, s. 10, where the *formatæ* are spoken of. But it will be observed that my Ancestor mentions several subjects, of which he never lived to treat. In fact he might haply have given to the Church at least three other Books had his valuable life been prolonged for a few more years. Ed.]

Bishop Morley [22], whose memory will for ever remain fresh in the hearts of the learned and the good; who, among many other eminent works of charity and generosity, becoming his great soul and high station in the Church, such as the augmentation of several small benefices, and provision of a decent habitation and maintenance for the widows of poor clergymen in his diocese, &c., has also bequeathed a very valuable collection of books to the Church of Winchester, for the advancement of learning among the parochial clergy; and I reckon it none of the least part of my happiness, that Providence removing me early from the University, where the best supplies of learning are to be had, placed me by the hands of a generous benefactor [23], without any importunity or seeking of my own, in such a station as gives me liberty and opportunity to make use of so good a library, though not so perfect [23] as I could wish. But the very mentioning this, as it is but a just debt to the memory of that great prelate, so perhaps it may provoke some other generous spirit, of like abilities and fortune with him, to add new supplies of modern books published since his death, to augment and complete his benefaction. Which would be an addition of new succours and auxiliaries to myself, and others in my circumstances, and better enable us to serve the public.

In the meantime, the reader may with ease enjoy what with no small pains and industry I have collected and put together; and he may make additions from his own reading and observation, as I have done upon several authors whom I have had occasion to peruse and mention. From some of which, and those of great fame and learning, I have sometimes thought myself obliged to dissent upon some nice and peculiar questions; but I have never done it without giving my reasons, and treating them with that decency and respect which is due to their great learning and character. If in any thing I have made mistakes of my own, as I cannot be so vain as to think I have made none, every intelligent reader may make himself judge, and correct them with ingenuity and candour. All I can say is, that I have been as careful to avoid mistakes as I could in so critical and curious a subject; and I hope there will not be found so many, but that this essay may prove useful both to the learned and unlearned; to instruct the one, who cannot read these things in their originals; and refresh the memories of the other, who may know

22 [Bishop of Winchester from 1662 to 1684. He was also one of the principal managers of the Savoy Conference. Ed.]

23 Dr. Radcliffe. [See the Life, p. 20, preceding. Ed.]

many things that they cannot always readily have recourse to. Or, if it be of no use to greater proficients, it may at least be some help to young students and new beginners, and both provoke them to the study of ancient learning, and a little prepare them for their entrance upon it. Besides, I considered there were some who might have a good inclination toward the study of these things, who yet have neither ability to purchase, nor time and opportunity to read over many ancient Fathers and Councils; and to such, a work of this nature, composed ready to their hands, might be of considerable use, to acquaint them with the state and practice of the Primitive Church, when they have no better opportunities to be informed about it.

If in any of these respects these collections, which were designed for the honour of the ancient Church and the benefit of the present, may prove serviceable toward those ends, I shall not think my time and pains ill bestowed.

VI.

THE AUTHOR'S DEDICATION,

[PREFIXED TO THE SECOND VOLUME OF THE ORIGINAL EDITION IN 1709, REPRINTED IN 1710.]

TO THE

RIGHT HON. AND RIGHT REV. FATHER IN GOD,

JONATHAN,

LORD BISHOP OF WINCHESTER,

AND PRELATE OF THE MOST NOBLE ORDER OF THE GARTER.

My Lord,

As the kind entertainment which your Lordship and the world have been pleased to give to the first part of this work, has encouraged me to go on in hopes of doing public service to the Church; so the nature of the subject contained in this second volume, being but a continuation of the former account of the primitive clergy, obliges me again with all submission to present this second part to your Lordship, in hopes of no less kind acceptance and approbation. The matters here treated of are many of them things of the greatest importance, which when plainly set in order and presented to public view, may perhaps excite the zeal of many in the present age to copy out those necessary duties, by the practice of which the Primitive Church attained to great perfection and glory; and, as I may say, still provokes and calls us to the same attainments by so many excellent rules and noble examples.

In the fourth and sixth of these Books, I have endeavoured to draw up something of the general character of the primitive clergy,

by showing what qualifications were required in them before their ordination, and what sort of laws they were to be governed by afterwards; respecting both their lives and labours, in the continual exercise of the duties of their function. Many of them, I must own, have been very affecting to myself in the consideration of them; and as I was willing to hope they might prove so to such others as would be at the pains to read them. For here are both directions and provocations of the best sort to excite our industry, and inflame our zeal, and to make us eager and restless in copying out the pattern set before us.

If any shall think I have collected these things together to reflect upon any persons in the present age, I shall only say with one of the Ancients [24] in a like case,—'They mistake my design; which was not to reproach any man's person who bears the sacred character of a priest, but to write what might be for the public benefit of the Church. For, as when orators and philosophers describe the qualities which are required to make a complete orator or philosopher, they do no injury to Demosthenes or Plato, but only describe things nakedly in themselves without any personal applications; so in the description of a bishop or priest, and explication of ancient rules, nothing more is intended but to propose a mirror of the priesthood; in which it will be in every man's power and conscience to take a view of himself, so as neither to grieve at the sight of his own deformity, or rejoice when he beholds his own beauty in the glass.'

Nothing is here proposed but rules and examples of the noblest virtues; probity and integrity of life; studies and labours becoming the clerical function; piety and devotion in our constant addresses to God; fidelity, diligence, and prudence in preaching his word to men; carefulness and exactness, joined with discretion and charity, in the administration of public and private discipline; candour and ingenuity in composing needless disputes among good men; and zeal in opposing and confronting the powerful and wily designs of heretics and wicked men; together with resolution and patience in

24 Hieron. Ep. 83. [al. Ep. 69.] ad Ocean. t. 2. p. 323. (t. 1. p. 419 e.) Ne quis me in sugillationem istius temporis sacerdotum scripsisse, quæ scripsi, existimet, sed in ecclesiæ utilitatem. Ut enim oratores et philosophi, describentes qualem velint esse perfectum oratorem et philosophum, non faciunt injuriam Demostheni et Platoni, sed res ipsas absque personis definiunt: sic in descriptione episcopi, et in eorum expositione, quæ scripta sunt, quasi speculum sacerdotii proponitur. Jam in potestate et conscientia singulorum est, quales se ibi aspiciant; ut vel dolere ad deformitatem, vel gaudere ad pulchritudinem possint.

suffering persecutions, calumnies, and reproaches, both from professed enemies and pretended friends; with many other instances of the like commendable virtues, which shined in the lives and adorned the profession of the primitive clergy: whose rules and actions, I dare promise myself, your Lordship and all good men will read with pleasure, because they will but see their own beauty represented in the glass: and they that fall short of the character here given will find it a gentle admonition and spur to set in order the things that are wanting in their conduct, and to labour with more zeal to bring themselves a little nearer to the primitive standard.

Your Lordship is enabled by your high station and calling to revive the exercise of ancient discipline among your clergy in a more powerful way; and you have given us already some convincing proofs that it is your settled resolution and intention so to do. As the thought of this is a real pleasure to the diligent and virtuous, so it is to be hoped it will prove a just terror to those of the contrary character; and by introducing a strict discipline among the clergy, make way for the easier introduction of it among the laity also; the revival of which has long been desired, though but slow steps are made toward the restoration of it. In the meantime, it becomes every man according to his ability, though in a lower station, to contribute his endeavours toward the promoting these good ends; to which purpose I have collected and digested these observations upon the laws and discipline of the ancient clergy, that such as are willing to be influenced by their practice may have great and good examples set before them: whilst they, whom examples cannot move, may be influenced another way, by the authority which your Lordship and others in the same station are invested with, for the benefit and edification of the Church; the promoting of which is and ever will be the hearty endeavour of him, who is,

My Lord,

Your Lordship's most dutiful

and obedient servant,

JOSEPH BINGHAM.

HEADBOURN-WORTHY,
1710.

VII.

DEDICATION

[PREFIXED TO BOTH PARTS OF THE THIRD VOLUME IN 1711.]

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

AND RIGHT REVEREND FATHER IN GOD,

JONATHAN,

LORD BISHOP OF WINCHESTER,

AND PRELATE OF THE MOST NOBLE ORDER OF THE GARTER,

THIS THIRD VOLUME OF THE ANTIQUITIES

OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

IS HUMBLY SUBMITTED AND INSCRIBED BY THE AUTHOR,

HIS LORDSHIP'S

MOST DUTIFUL AND OBEDIENT SERVANT,

JOSEPH BINGHAM.

VIII.

THE AUTHOR'S DEDICATION,

[PREFIXED TO THE FOURTH VOLUME IN 1715.]

TO

HIS MOST SACRED MAJESTY,

GEORGE,

BY THE GRACE OF GOD KING OF GREAT BRITAIN, FRANCE, AND IRELAND, DEFENDER OF THE FAITH, &c.

MOST GRACIOUS SOVEREIGN,

I HUMBLY beg leave to lay at your Majesty's feet a part of a larger work, which was at first designed to promote those great and worthy ends, which your Majesty in your princely wisdom by your royal declarations has lately thought fit to recommend to your Universities and Clergy: that is, the promotion of Christian piety and knowledge, and such useful learning as may instil good principles into the minds of younger students; upon which the prosperity of Church and State will in this and all succeeding ages so much depend. The practice of the primitive ages of the Church, when reduced into one view, seems to be one of the most proper means to effect these honourable designs; and with that consideration I have hitherto proceeded in this laborious work, not without the countenance and approbation of many worthy men, and now hope to finish it under your Majesty's favour and protection: humbly beseeching Almighty God to bless your Majesty's great designs for the good of this Church and Nation, and the Protestant interest abroad: which is, and ever shall be, the hearty prayer of

Your Majesty's
Most loyal and obedient servant,
JOSEPH BINGHAM.

IX.

THE AUTHOR'S DEDICATION,

[PREFIXED TO THE NINTH VOLUME IN 1722.]

TO THE

RIGHT HON. AND RIGHT REV. FATHER IN GOD,

CHARLES,

[DR. TRIMNELL,]

LORD BISHOP OF WINCHESTER,

AND PRELATE OF THE MOST NOBLE ORDER OF THE GARTER.

MY LORD,

IT was one of those ancient rules, many of which I have had occasion to speak of in this work, that presbyters should do nothing *ἄνευ γνώμης τοῦ ἐπισκόπου*, or *sine conscientia episcopi, without the consent or knowledge of the bishop:* which though it extend not to all private, domestical, and secular affairs, yet doubtless it was intended to keep a good harmony and subordination between them, in all matters of a public nature relating to the affairs and welfare of the Church. And therefore with a view to this rule, as I first presented the beginning of this work to your predecessor, my then diocesan, so now I lay this last and finishing part[26] of it at your Lordship's feet: not doubting but that your Lordship, who is an encourager of good literature and ancient learning, will give it your favourable acceptance and approbation. I have the more reason to hope for this, because, out of your great good nature and condescension,

[26] [Vols. 9 and 10, containing the last four Books and Indices of Authors and Matter. ED.]

your Lordship has always been an encourager of the undertaking, as I have been made sensible by happy experiment, in many years' distant correspondence with you.

The work, I hope, is of general use, and will meet with a general acceptance among all those who are without prejudice true lovers of ancient learning. A noble lord was once pleased to tell me, he had sent it into Scotland by the hands of a great man of the Assembly: though what approbation it meets with there I cannot say. But I can speak it with more satisfaction, that our worthy Primate [27] was once pleased to acquaint me in private conversation, that he himself had sent it to the Professors of Geneva, who returned him their thanks, together with their approbation. And if it be well accepted there, there is some reason to hope it may be accepted in most other Protestant Churches, and be a little means to bring them to a nearer union to the Church of England in some points, for which some parts of the work are particularly designed. A late author [28] has thought fit to epitomize some part of it, for the service, as he says, of his poor brethren of the clergy: though, I fear, for the reasons I have been forced to give against his undertaking, it will prove of no service, but rather hurtful, to them. But if he, or any other person of ability, would undertake to translate the whole into Latin [29], now that it is finished and completed, that might perhaps be of more general use to all the Protestant Churches. And in the mean time our poor brethren, if it please God to bless me with health, shall not want such an epitome, if it be needful, as is proper for their information.

And now, my Lord, that I have made mention of my own health, I cannot but with hearty prayers to God most sincerely wish yours, for the good things you have already done to this diocese, and more that may be expected, if it shall please God to confirm your health in such a state as may enable you to go through the great work you want no will to perform. The reducing the exorbitant fees of this diocese to a proper standard, is a thing that will never be forgotten by your poor brethren, who will always feel the sweet effect of it. Your encouragement given to the meanest clergymen to write to yourself in person, and not to any officers, upon business relating to the Church, is a singular instance of your good nature and condescension; and also a sure method to prevent corruption.

27 Dr. John Wynne, Archbp. of Canterbury from 1714 to 1727.

28 A. Blackamore. See the commencement of the next Preface following.

29 Which, as mentioned in the Life, (p. 29,) Grischovius did between the years 1724 and 1729. Ed.]

Your care to inform yourself of the character and worth of your clergy, with a view to the promotion of such as have long laboured diligently in great cures or small livings, is a method that cannot fail of giving a new life and spirit to all such as may reasonably hope that their merits and labours will not always be overlooked and despised; but that they may in due time find their reward, both in ease and advancement, from so kind an inspector.

That you may have health and long life to proceed in such good acts, and all other offices of your function, I believe is the wish of all your clergy. I am sure it is the hearty prayer of him who is,

My Lord,

Your most dutiful

and obedient servant,

JOSEPH BINGHAM.

X.

THE AUTHOR'S PREFACE,

[TO HIS LAST TWO VOLUMES, PREFIXED TO THE TENTH VOLUME OF THE ORIGINAL EDITION IN 1722.]

WHEN I had finished these two volumes, [the ninth and tenth,] and completed the whole work that I intended, and sent it to the press, hoping to give myself a little rest and vacation from hard labour, I was immediately called to a new work by a Book that was sent me, bearing the title of '*Ecclesiæ Primitivæ Notitia;* or, A Summary of Christian Antiquities, &c.'[29]: 'to which is prefixed an *Index Hæreticus*, containing a short account of *All the Principal Heresies* since the rise of Christianity;' and subjoined, 'A Brief Account of the Eight first General Councils. Dedicated to the Venerable Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts, by A. Blackamore: in two volumes 8vo., Lond. 1722.'

I confess, I was very much surprised at first with the Title and Epistle Dedicatory, thinking it to be some new work, that had done some mighty thing, either in correcting my mistakes, or supplying my deficiencies, after twenty years' hard labour in compiling my ORIGINES for the use of the Church. But as soon as I looked into the Preface, and a little into the Book itself, I found it to be only a

29 [This book was translated into German by F. E. Rambach: *Ant. Blackamore's Chr. Alterthümer; aus dem Engl. übersetzt, Th. I. II. Breslau,* 1768–69. 8. ED.]

transcript of some part[30] of my ORIGINES, under the notion of an *Epitome*, though no such thing is said in the title-page. This seems to be an art of the gentleman, and the ten booksellers[31] that are in combination with him, to render my books unuseful, and his own more valuable, as containing all I have said and something more at a less price; which, he says, 'will be of use to those poor clergymen and others, whose genius and inclination lie towards Antiquity, but are not able to purchase my books for the dearness of them.'

But the gentleman imposes very much upon poor readers in saying this, upon two accounts: first, in pretending that he gives them *an epitome of my whole work*, when yet there were two volumes still behind, which he could have no opportunity to epitomize, because they were not printed. He says indeed in his Preface, that I had happily completed my whole work in eight volumes, and gives it an higher commendation and *elogium*[32] than perhaps it really deserves. But where he learned that I had finished my work *in eight volumes*, I cannot understand; I am sure I had advertised the readers, and him among the rest, that I intended *two volumes more*, which I now give them to complete my design. So that this gentleman deceives his poor brethren, when he pretends to give them an *Epitome* of the whole, when it is only in part; and he must put them to the charge of another volume to make even his *Epitome* complete.

But, secondly, if this gentleman was so concerned for his poor brethren, why did he make his *Epitome* so large? The substance of my books for the use of such men might be brought into much less

30 [Mr. Blackamore's second volume, which is dedicated to Sir Richard Blackmore, Kt., goes as far as to the end of my Ancestor's nineteenth Book, which finished his eighth volume in 1720. ED.]

31 [Printed for E. Bell, J. Darby, A. Bettesworth, F. Fayram, J. Pemberton, J. Hooke, C. Rivington, F. Clay, J. Battey, E. Symon. See the foot of the title-page. ED.]

32 ['That excellent gentleman, worthy to be had in everlasting veneration and remembrance for this his most laborious and useful undertaking, having observed how assiduous and careful most of the learned world were to improve themselves in the knowledge of the antiquities of the Gentile world, and how remiss in their searches after the more noble and advantageous acquirement of a thorough skill in Church-antiquities, to excite the present and succeeding ages to that study, with indefatigable industry set himself about this work, which, whosoever shall allow himself the time and pleasure to peruse, I dare believe he will conclude it one of the most complete Bodies of Antiquities in any kind.' Blackamore's Preface, p. 1. ED.]

compass: there needed no authorities to have been cited for their use who have no books to examine and compare them, but they might have rested upon the authority of the compiler; whose authority they may more decently and honestly use upon any occasion, than the authority of Fathers and Councils, which our author, with me, very well supposes they have no opportunity to see.

And, further, if our author meant to gratify his poor brethren at an easy rate, why did he clog his *Epitome*, both before and behind, with two long discourses of his own? Sure this was not to make it cheaper, but to put them to more expense, in being obliged to buy his discourses, if they were minded to read any thing of mine.

The fair way of epitomizing had been to have given an abstract of my books by themselves, and printed his own separate from them: this had been more for the interest of his indigent readers, and I believe he will find it would have been more for the interest of his booksellers. I know not what authority he or his booksellers had to reprint my books in effect, which are my property by law. But I argue not with him at present upon that point. If he had done it in a genteel way, by asking leave, and under direction, he should have had my leave and encouragement also. Or, if he had done it usefully, so as truly to answer the end he pretends, even without leave, he should have had my pardon.

But now he has defeated his own design, both by unnecessary and hurtful additions of his own, which will not only incommode and incumber his books, but render them dangerous and pernicious to unwary readers, unless timely antidoted and corrected by some more skilful hand. For which reason, since they are sent into the world together with an Abstract of my Antiquities, I have thought it just both to the world and myself to make some proper animadversions on them.

I freely own that a just and authentic Account of Ancient and Modern Sects and Heresies, done by a learned and judicious hand, would be a very useful work: and it is what has been long wanted, and long desired by many learned men, who observe the failings of the common Heresiologists on all sides. But I cannot see what an Account of Modern Heresies has to do with the Antiquities of the Church, or how the knowledge of modern sectaries can help to explain the ancient usages and practices of the Catholics in former ages. For which reason our author might have dropped that part of his work, without any detriment, to have made his book the cheaper.

But whether it was proper or improper to clog his work with any account of heresies ancient or modern; what had been done in either kind should have been done with care and judgment and something of exactness, which, after all the compliments he passes on my work, I cannot say of his, and I am heartily sorry that in justice to the world I cannot do it. For some of his accounts are very trifling and jejune, and such as give no light or information to a reader: others are very false and injurious to great men, whom he makes *heretics*, when they were really the great defenders of the Catholic faith: and his whole account is very imperfect, omitting some of the most considerable sects and errors, whilst his title-page pretends to be an *Account of all the Principal Heresies since the rise of Christianity.*

I love not to censure any man without reason, and therefore I will give some evident proof of each particular I lay to his charge: only premising one thing, which I believe will make the grammarians smile. The running title of his treatise is *Index Hæreticus*, which in English is not what he calls it, *An Account of Heresies*, but *An Heretical Index;* which I believe he did not intend should be its character. But if we soften the meaning of the word *heretical*, and take it only for *erroneous*, however ominous it be, it is a very just character indeed. For besides its other faults, it is *very erroneous* in the characters he gives of very great and orthodox and eminent saints of God, who in his account are some of the worst of heretics. I will make good in order the several charges I bring against him.

1. Some of his accounts are very trifling and jejune, and such as give no light or information to a reader.

In speaking of the *Hypsistarians*, all that he says of them is only this, (p. 36,) 'that they were maintainers of an heresy in the fourth century, made up of Judaism and Paganism.' Now what is a reader the wiser for all this? This character, being in such general terms only, would serve at least twenty heresies, and a reader would not know how to distinguish them, seeing no particular opinions or practices of Jews or Gentiles are here ascribed to the *Hypsistarians* whereby to discern them from other heretics that mixed Judaism and Paganism in one common religion. He says in his Preface, one of the chief reasons for drawing up his *Index Hæreticus* was, 'because in my books I had only touched lightly and *in transitu* upon heresies, as they made for my purpose, without giving any perfect description of them.' Which is very true. But why then did not he give a perfect description of those *Hypsistarians*, or at least a more perfect one than I had done? He could not be ignorant, whilst he was epitomizing my books, that

I had given a pretty good description of them, in Book XVI, chap. 6, sect. 2, p. 306. vol. 7 [33], where I say, 'they called themselves *Hypsistarians*, that is, *Worshippers of the Most High God*, whom they worshipped, as the Jews did, only in one person, and they observed their Sabbaths, and used distinction of meats, clean and unclean, though they did not regard circumcision, as Gregory Nazianzen, whose father was once of this sect, gives the account of them.' This is some account of them, if it be not a perfect one. Why then did he not give the same or a better account of them, or at least refer his reader to my Book, or his own *Epitome*, (v. 2, p. 335,) where he transcribes my account of them? The gentleman was in haste when he wrote his *Index*, and could not stand to do justice either to me or his readers.

I could add something more concerning these *Hypsistarians* out of Gregory Nyssen, Hesychius, and Suidas: but it will be time enough to do that, if I live to give the reader an *Epitome* of my own with some additions. I only remark here, that there is no notice taken of these *Hypsistarians* in Epiphanius, Theodoret, Philastrius, or St. Austin, or any other of the common Heresiologists; and that they who speak of them say nothing of their Paganism, however our author came to blunder upon it.

His account of the *Cœlicolæ*, (p. 21,) is much such another as the former: '*Cœlicolæ*, or *Worshippers of Heaven*, an heretical sect in the fifth century, at which time they were condemned by the Rescripts of Honorius the Emperor.' It is hard again that he could not have referred his readers to the same place of my book, or his own *Epitome*, where they might have found a much better account of them. But this gentleman was to magnify his own *Index*, and make his readers believe that he had done great feats and wonders in discovering the tenets of ancient heretics, where I had been silent, or but lightly touched upon them; though by these instances the reader will now be able to judge of the perfection and excellency of his performance.

I will give but one instance more of this kind out of many that might be added. In speaking of the *Ethnophrones*, (p. 28,) he says, 'they were heretics of the seventh century, who taught that some Pagan superstitions were to be retained together with Christianity.' But why did he not inform his reader what these Pagan superstitions were? Is there no author that speaks particularly of them? The learned reader may please to take this account from me in the words

[33] [Vol. 6, p. 273, of the present edition of the Whole Works. Ed.]

of Damascenus, De Hæresibus[34], *Ethnophrones cum Gentium instituta sequantur, in cæteris sunt Christiani. Hi natales dies, fortunam, fatum, omnem astronomiam et astrologiam, omnemque divinationem et auspicia probant: auguria, expiationes et placationes, sortes, prodigiorum et portentorum inspectiones, veneficia, aliasque ejusdem generis impias fabulas adhibent: iisdemque, quibus Gentes, utuntur institutis. Dies etiam festos quosdam Græcorum probant. Dies denique, et menses, et annos, et tempora observant et notant.* In short, they were the same with those superstitious Christians who followed the forbidden Heathen arts of divination, magic, and enchantment, judicial astrology, calculation of nativities, augury, soothsaying, divination by lots, observation of days and accidents, and the observation of Heathen festivals, of whom I have so largely and particularly treated in two whole chapters (Book XVI. chap. 4 and 5.[35]) where I speak of the discipline and laws of the Church made against them. And yet this gentleman will bear his readers in hand that he has given a perfect account of those ancient sects and heresies, which I only occasionally and lightly touch upon.

2. The second charge I have against his *Index* is more weighty: that many of his accounts of heresies and heretics are very false, and highly injurious to the character and memory of great, and good, and excellent men, whom he makes *heretics*, when they were really noble confessors and brave defenders of the Catholic faith.

For proof of this I will not insist upon the characters he gives of Melito Bishop of Sardes, or of Nicholas the Deacon; but only observe that a prudent writer might have softened his character of each. For, though Valesius[36] bears hard upon Melito, and says with our author, 'that he asserted God to be corporeal, in a book which he wrote Περὶ Θεοῦ Ἐνσωμάτου,' which Valesius translates, *De Deo Corporeo*, yet other learned persons[37] think this to be a mistake; since Θεὸς ἐνσώματος does not signify *a corporeal God*, but *God incarnate*, or *made flesh*, or *dwelling in the body;* which is a quite different

[34] Ed. Basil. 1575. p. 585. [Ed. Venet. 1748. (t. 1. p. 108.) where the terms vary, but the sense is the same. Ed.]

[35] [Vol. 6, pp. 196–270, of this new edition. Ed.]

[36] Not. in Euseb. l. 4. c. 26. (v. 1. pp. 243, 249.) [Relating to the enumeration of the works of Melito, but containing no *direct* strictures on the book Περὶ Θεοῦ Ἐνσωμάτου that I can discover. Ed.]

[37] Cave, Hist. Liter. (v. 1. p. 43. Περὶ Ἐνσωμάτου Θεοῦ, *De Deo* (non corporeo, sed) *corporato*, seu *corpore* induto, &c.—Du Pin, in the Life of Melito, (t. 1. p. 63.) De Dieu Incarné..... La propre signification du nom Grec, &c.—Suicer. Thes. Eccles. voce Ἐνσωμάτωσις. (t. 1. p. 1122.) . . . Inter libros Melitonis, &c.

thing from God's being corporeal in his divine nature. And therefore, since thus much might justly have been said by way of apology, for Melito, our Author should not have been so severe upon him as to style him an heretic of the first ages, who held that God was corporeal; but have alleged in his favour what so many learned men have said in justification of him: especially considering what both Polycrates [38] in Eusebius and Tertullian [39] in St. Jerom say of him, 'that he was a man filled with the Holy Ghost, and generally believed to be a prophet among Christians.'

The same apology might have been made, and in justice should have been made, for Nicholas, one of the Seven Deacons. For though some of the Ancients lay the doctrine of the Nicolaitans to his charge; yet, as I show in one of the preceding Books [40], a great many others, particularly Clemens Alexandrinus, Eusebius, Theodoret, and St. Austin, excuse him, and say, 'the doctrine was none of his, but only taken up by those who pretended to be his followers, grounded upon some mistaken words of his which had no such meaning.'

But I pass over this to our Author's account of the *Acephali*, (p. 2,) who, he says, 'were a *headless* kind of heretics, who owned neither bishop, priest, nor sacrament, like our modern Quakers.' I know not what grounds our Author had for this: for he never cites any particular writer throughout his whole *Index*: but I know Alexander Rosse [41] said the same before him; and he is one of this gentleman's learned authors. I know also that some Popish writers [42] object it to the Lutherans, 'that they are like the old *Acephali*, because they have no bishops for their leaders:' and I am apt to think Alexander Rosse took it, right or wrong, from some

38 Ap. Euseb. l. 5. c. 24. (v. 1. p. 244. 6.) . . . Μελίτωνα, τὸν εὐνοῦχον, τὸν ἐν Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι πάντα πολιτευσάμενον.

39 De Scriptor. Eccles. c. 24. [al. De Vir. Illustr.] (t. 2. p. 853.) Hujus elegans et declamatorium ingenium Tertullianus in septem libris, quos scripsit adversus Ecclesiam pro Montano, cavillatur, dicens eum a plerisque nostrorum prophetam putari.

40 B. XXII. ch. 1. s. 2. [v. 8, p. 3, of this edition. Ed.]

41 [A voluminous author, Chaplain to Charles I. and Master of the Free School at Southampton. He died anno 1654. See his ΠΑΝΣΕΒΕΙΑ, or, A View of all Religions in the World, with the several Church-Governments from the Creation to these Times. Also a Discovery of all known Heresies in all Ages and Places. A third edition, enlarged and perfected; to which are annexed the Lives, Actions, and Ends of certain Notorious Heretics with their Effigies in copper-plates. Lond. 1658. sm. 8vo. Ed.]

42 See Mason's Defence of the Ordination of the Ministers beyond Seas, (p. 129.) Oxford, 1641.

of those Popish writers. But Alexander has the misfortune to contradict himself: for he says in the very same breath, 'that Severus, Bishop of Alexandria, (he meant Antioch,) was author of this sect of *Acephali*, under Anastasius the Emperor, anno 462. And that they were called also *Theodosians*, from Theodosius their chief patron, and Bishop of Alexandria.' Strange indeed, that they should have bishops for their authors and patrons, and yet be without bishop, priest, or sacrament among them! Our Author was aware of this rock, and had the wit to avoid it: and therefore here he fairly and wisely dropped his guide, and left him to shift for himself with his contradictions; telling us the first part of the story, but not the latter, which would have spoiled his parallel between the *Acephali* and the *Quakers*. But how would he make out, if he was pressed hard to it, that the *Acephali* had no bishops, or were named *Headless*, from the want of such heads among them? For my part, I never met with any ancient writer that gave this account of them. Liberatus[43] says, 'they were called *Acephali*, because they would not receive the doctrine of Cyril of Alexandria, nor follow him as their *head*, nor yet any other.' But these were bishops, who would neither take Cyril, patriarch of Alexandria, nor John, patriarch of Antioch, for their head, and were therefore called *Acephali*, because they would follow neither patriarch as their leader. For as those bishops were called *Autocephali*, who had no patriarch above them, but were a sort of patriarchs themselves and independent of any other: so those bishops, who were subject to patriarchs and withdrew their obedience from them, were called *Acephali*, because they were *no heads or patriarchs themselves*, and yet refused to be subject to any other. Patriarchs were then heads of the bishops, as bishops were heads of the people; and these are quite different things; for bishops to be called *Acephali* because they rejected their patriarch, and people to be called *Acephali* because they had neither bishop, nor priest, nor sacrament among them.

I am not fond of defending ancient heretics, but I think all men ought to have justice done them, and not be charged with more heresies than they were really guilty of. It is allowed on all sides that these *Acephali* were Eutychians and enemies of the Council of Chalcedon; and as such Leontius[44] also writes against them: but he says not a word of their being without bishops, priests, or sacra-

43 Breviar. c. 9. (ap. Labb. CC. t. 5. p. 751 D.) Hos esse puto auctores Acephalorum, qui neque Cyrillum habent caput, neque quem sequantur ostendunt.

44 De Sectis. Action. 7. (ap. Bibl. Patr. Gr. Lat. t. 1. p. 522.)

ments: and therefore it lies upon our Author to produce some ancient voucher, better than Alexander Rosse, for the charge he brings against them.

I insist not on his little grammatical error in his account of the *Saccophori*, who, he says, (p. 67,) 'were a branch of the *Encratites*, so called because *they carried a long bag*, to make the people believe they led a penitent life.' They were indeed a particular sect of the Manichees, who are condemned under that name in several laws of the Theodosian Code [45], where the several branches of the Manichees are proscribed under the distinguishing names of *Solitarii*, *Encratitæ*, *Apotactitæ*, *Hydroparastatæ* and *Saccophori*, which names they assumed to shelter themselves against the severity of former laws made against the Manichees under the name of *Manichees* only. But now these *Manichean Saccophori* were not so called from carrying a long bag, but from *wearing sackcloth*, and affecting to appear with it in public. *Saccus*, indeed, will signify *a sack* or *a bag*, as well as *sackcloth:* but what has a long bag to do with a penitent life? It is fitter to describe a philosopher than a penitent: but sackcloth and a penitent life will consist very well together. However, the Church did not allow any to affect this garb, though some monks, like the Manichees, were very fond of it, and loved to appear publicly with chains or crosses about their necks, and walked barefoot, and wore sackcloth, out of mere singularity and affectation: who are therefore often severely censured for these things by the ancients, Epiphanius, St. Austin, St. Jerom, Palladius, and Cassian, as I have shown more fully in another place [46]. But I never heard of any, either monks or heretics, censured for carrying a long bag as an indication of a penitent life: and I am of opinion that this gentleman, when he considers it again, will reckon this such another slip as *Index Hæreticus*; which are but small failings in comparison of what I have now further to object against his Index, which turns Catholics into Heretics in several instances both of former and later ages.

Among the Ancients he does great injustice to Eustathius, the famous Bishop of Antioch. For in giving an account of the Eustathian Heretics, he says, (p. 28,) 'the Eustathians were the spawn of the Sabellian heresy, and had their name from *Eustathius* Bishop of Antioch, who was deposed in a Council held in his own city, about the middle of the fourth century, for holding those principles.' I take no notice of his parachronism in saying, that he

[45] L. 16. t. 5. De Hæreticis, legg. 7, 9, 11. (t. 6. pp. 120 seqq.)

[46] B. 7. ch. 3. s. 6. [v. 2. pp. 359—362, of this edition. Ed.]

was deposed in the Council of Antioch *about the middle of the fourth century:* for though we cannot well call the year 327 or 329, when that Council was held, *the middle of the fourth century;* yet this is but a small mistake, into which he might easily be led by Baronius or the corrupt copies of Athanasius and St. Jerom, which place that Council in the reign of Constantius, instead of Constantine, as the best critics, Valesius[47], Gothofred[48], Pagi[49], and Dr. Cave[50], are fully agreed; and as appears plainly from all the historians, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Philostorgius. But the thing I complain of is this, that he makes this Eustathius 'a Sabellian,' and his followers 'a spawn of the Sabellian heresy.' Whereas, in truth, he was the great defender of the Catholic faith against the Arian heresy in the Council of Nice: the Council itself translated him from Berræa to Antioch; and he was the first man that opened the Council with a panegyrical oration to Constantine; as this Author, forgetting himself, fairly owns in his account of the Eight General Councils at p. 476. Athanasius[51] gives him this character, 'that he was a noble confessor and orthodox in the faith, *τὴν πίστιν εὐσεβὴς*, and exceeding zealous for the truth.' How then could he be a Sabellian, unless Sabellianism was the true faith, and Athanasius a Sabellian also?

To open this matter a little further, and undeceive this gentleman and his readers also: this Eustathius was only abused in his character out of spite and malice by the Arians, who were his implacable enemies, because he was a resolute defender of the Nicene faith against them. They therefore endeavoured to make him odious, by falsely charging him with Sabellianism, and several other crimes, upon the strength of which calumnies they deposed him in one of their own Councils at Antioch. Socrates[52] and Sozomen[53] say expressly, that this Council of Antioch was an Arian Council that deposed Eustathius, upon a pretence, 'that he was more a defender

47 Not. in Euseb. de Vit. Constant. l. iii. c. 59. (v. 1. p. 614. n. 3.) Quamobrem assentiri non possum, &c.

48 Dissert. in Philostorg. l. ii. c. 7. (Genev. 1642. 4to. pp. 60, seqq.) De Eusebianis ab exsilio revocatis, &c.

49 Pagi. Critic. in Baron. an. 327. n. 3. (t. 1. p. 420.)—It. an. 340. n. 18. [al. 17.) (ibid. p. 450.)

50 Hist. Liter. (v. i. p. 139.) .. At vero contigisse hæc sub Constantino, &c.

51 Epist. ad Solitar. Vit. Agent. t. i. p. 812. (t. 1. part. 1. p. 274 b.) .... *Ἀνὴρ ὁμολογητὴς, καὶ τὴν πίστιν εὐσεβὴς, κ.τ.λ.*

52 L. 1. c. 24. (v. 2. p. 58. 15) .. *Ὡς τὰ Σαβελλίου μᾶλλον φρονοῦντα, ἢ ἅπερ ἡ ἐν Νικαίᾳ σύνοδος ἐδογμάτισεν, κ.τ.λ.*

53 L. 2. c. 19. (ibid. p. 68. 44.) .. *Καθότι τὴν ἐν Νικαίᾳ πίστιν ἐπῄνει, κ.τ.λ.*

of the Sabellian doctrine than of the Nicene faith.' Which was an usual trick of the Arians, whereby they endeavoured to undermine Athanasius also. Now this being only a mere calumny and slander of so great a man, imposed upon him by his professed enemies, the Arians, it does not become any one, who takes upon him to give unlearned readers an account of the ancient heresies, to fix this character upon him, without giving some authority, or at least an intimation, that he was deposed only in an Arian Council. I do not suppose this gentleman had any ill design in what he wrote about this matter; but he was either imposed upon by some modern historian, or did not sufficiently consider what he found delivered by ancient writers. Which should make him the more cautious for the future what guides he follows, and learn to write with judgment, when he takes upon him the office of an historian for such as cannot contradict him.

He commits the same fault in giving an account of the *Essenes*, who, he says, (p. 28,) were 'a sect of Christian heretics at Alexandria in the time of St. Mark.' Now there seems to be a little more of wilful mistake in this. For he could not be ignorant, whilst he was transcribing my ORIGINES, that I had alleged the authority of Epiphanius, Eusebius, and St. Jerom [54], to show, that they believed them to be the orthodox Church, and not a sect of Christian heretics at Alexandria in the time of St. Mark: and he himself in his Epitome, (pp. 1, 2,) refers his readers to these authorities also. I said further, which he leaves out, that some learned modern writers, such as Valesius, Scaliger, and Dallæus, question whether they were Christians; whilst Bishop Beveridge and others maintain the common opinion. But all agree that they were not a sect of Christian heretics; however this Author came to despise all authority, both ancient and modern, in fixing that character upon them. For if they were heretics, they belonged to the Jews, and not to the Christians.

In his accounts of modern heretics, which he might have spared in a book of Ecclesiastical Antiquities, he is much more injurious to the reader, as well as to the pious memory of great numbers of many excellent men, and to the Protestant cause in general, when he puts the *Albigenses*, the *Hussites* or *Bohemians*, the *Lollards*, the *Waldenses*, and the *Wicklevites* all into his black list of heretics; ascribing to them such monstrous opinions as they were certainly

[54] [See b. 1. ch. 1. s. 1. v. 1. pp. 1, 2. nn. 1, 2, 3, speaking of the *Jessæans*, and ibid. nn. 4, 5. ED.]

never guilty of, but only stood falsely charged with them by the implacable malice of their Romish adversaries, who treated them just as the Arians did Athanasius and Eustathius in former ages. It might have become a Protestant heresiologist and historian, either to have omitted these names, or at least to have told his readers what excellent vindications and apologies have been written by the most learned Protestant authors of the two last ages, to clear their character of those black and odious imputations, which their adversaries falsely and industriously threw upon them. If he knew nothing of these vindications, he was very ill qualified to act the part of an historian in this case: if he did know them, he was more unpardonable still, in concealing from his readers what in all justice, both to them and the Church, and the memory of the saints who were so traduced, he ought carefully to have laid before them. If he had thought fit to have looked into my SCHOLASTICAL HISTORY OF BAPTISM[55], as carefully as he has done into the ORIGINES, he might there have found the venerable names of some of those worthy men, who have done justice to the Protestant cause, in vindicating those witnesses of the truth from the false aspersions that are cast upon them. For his and the truth's sake, I will once more transcribe them, with a little addition, and more particular reference to the books and places containing those vindications:—

Crankanthorp, Defensio Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ contra Spalatensem, [Lond. 1625,] cap. 18. p. 100.

Usserius, De Christianarum Ecclesiarum Successione et Statu[56], cap. 10., quæ est de Albigensium et aliorum, qui Ecclesiæ Pontificiæ adversati sunt, Historia.

Albertinus, De Eucharistia, [Daventriæ, 1654.] lib. iii., p. 976., ubi agit de Wicklevistis, Waldensibus, Lollardis, Taboritis sive Bohemis.

Sir Samuel Morland[57], History of the Evangelical Churches of the Valleys of Piedmont. Lond. 1658. fol.

[55] [The first part, originally published in 1712, and reproduced in the ninth volume of this edition of the Whole Works. ED.]

[56] [In the second volume (p. 1.) of Ussher's Whole Works, Dublin, 1847 and following years, 18 vol. 8vo ED.]

[57] [When assistant to Secretary Thurlowe, he was sent by Cromwell to remonstrate with the Duke of Savoy on his conduct towards the persecuted Protestants of Piedmont. On his return, in 1658, he received the thanks of Parliament for his services, and published the work alluded to, now exceedingly scarce, the full title of which was as follows: *The History of the Evangelical Churches of the Valleys of Piedmont, containing a most exact Geographical Description of the Place, and a Faithful Account of the Doctrine, Life, and Persecutions of the*

Dr. Allix, History of the Albigenses. Lond. 1692. 2 vol. 4to.

Joachim Hesterberg, De Ecclesia Waldensium. Argent. 1668. 4to.

Paul Perrin, History of the Albigeois and Vaudois[58]. Lond. 1624. 4to.

Balthasar Lydius, Waldensia, sive Conservatio Veræ Ecclesiæ demonstrata ex Confessionibus Taboritarum et Bohemorum. Roterod. 1616. 2 vol. 8vo.

Cave, Historia Literaria, [Lond. 1688 et 1698. 2 tom. fol.] in Conspectu Sæculi Waldensis sive Duodecimi, [ap. tom. 2. ut supra, sive Oxon. 1740–43.]

Dr. Thomas James, Apology for John Wickliffe, shewing his conformity with the now Church of England. Oxford, 1608. 4to.

Dr. Henry Maurice, Vindication of the Primitive Church, p. 374. [Lond. 1682. 8vo.]

Ratio Disciplinæ Fratrum Bohemorum. Hagæ, 1660.

Hen. Wharton, Appendix ad Cave Hist. Literar. p. 50. in Vita Joan. Wicklef. p. 50. [ap. t. 2. Ed. Lond. 1688 et 1698, sive ut supra.]

The Life of Wickliffe, by a late Author. Lond. 8vo.

Comenii Historia Persecutionum Ecclesiæ Bohemicæ. Lugd. Bat. 1647. 8vo.

Item, Historia Ecclesiæ Slavonicæ, &c.

Anthony Leger, Histoire Vaudois des Eglises des Vallées de Piedmont. Lugd. Bat. 1669. fol.

Waldensium Confessio contra Claudicantes Hussitas. Basil. 1566. 8vo. See also in the Fasciculus Rerum Expetendarum et Fugiendarum, tom. 1. [Lond. 1690. fol.]

Conradus Danhauerus, [Danhawer,] Ecclesia Waldensium Orthodoxiæ Lutheranæ Testis et Socia. Argent. 1659. 4to.

Samuel Maresius [Desmarets], Dissertatio Historico-Theologica de Waldensibus. Groning. 1660. 4to.

Ægidius Stauchius, Historico-Theologica Disquisitio de Waldensibus. Wittenberg. 1675. 4to.

Petrus Wesenbeccius, De Waldensibus et Principum Protestantium Epistolis huc pertinentibus. 1603. 4to.

Ancient Inhabitants. Together with a most naked and punctual Relation of the late bloody Massacre, 1655, *and a Narrative of all the following Transactions to* 1658. This Author was made a Baronet at the Reformation for having informed the royal exiles of a plot for enticing them into England in order to effect their destruction. Ed.]

[58] [Full title: *Luther's Forerunners; or, A cloud of Witnesses deposing for the Protestant Faith, gathered together in The History of the Waldenses; who for divers hundred years before Luther successfully opposed Popery, professed the Truth of the Gospel, and sealed it with their Blood.* Translated by Samson Lennard. Ed.]

Joannes Lasicius, Veræ Religionis Apologia. Spiræ, 1582.

Now is it possible, among such a number of fine discourses and elaborate pieces upon this subject, a person, who writes the *Account of Heresies*, should never have met with or heard of any apologies that were made in behalf of these men; but he must needs take his accounts crudely, as delivered by their professed enemies? If the account of Ranerius[59], their adversary, but an ingenuous Popish writer, be taken, it does them abundantly more justice than this Author: for though he calls them *a sect*, yet he says, 'it was an ancient sect: for some said it had continued from the time of Pope Sylvester; and others, from the time of the Apostles: and whereas all other sects were accompanied with horrible blasphemies against God, which would make a man tremble, this of the Leonists had a great show of piety. They lived uprightly before men, and believed all things aright of God, and all the articles contained in the Creed: only they blasphemed and hated the Church of Rome.'

Were these the Waldenses, 'that rejected episcopacy, and the Apostles' Creed, and all holy orders, and the power of the magistrate, and approved of adulterous embraces, and practised promiscuous copulation,' as our author represents them, (pp. 78, 79,) styling them, by way of contempt, 'the religion-mongers and pious reformers of the twelfth century?' If our author were put to apologise for himself, he would lay all the blame upon Alexander Rosse. For he is his learned author from whom he transcribed. And Alexander tells us ingenuously he had his accounts from Baronius, Genebrard, Sanders, Gualterus, Bellarmin, Viegas, Florimundus Raimundus, Prateolus, Gregory de Valentia, and such other writers, who were noted Papists, and inveterate enemies of the Waldensian and Protestant religion. And should an author who writes about heresies have given his accounts, designed for the use of Protestant readers, out of such authors, when he might have had recourse to one or more of such a number of excellent Protestant writers, who have cleared up the character of the Waldenses, and vindicated their memory out of their own writings and Confessions of Faith, which are the most certain evidences of their religions? It is amazing to think how any ingenuous writer, who pretends to the least knowledge of books and learning, should give such a black character of those excellent confessors and witnesses of the truth, without

59 [Or Reinerus, who lived in the fifteenth century and belonged to the Order of the Preaching Friars. For his *Liber contra Waldenses* see the Biblioth. Max. Lugdun. 1677. t. 25. pp. 262, seqq. Ed.]

suggesting the least tittle of what so many learned men have said, or what may be said, in their vindication. I will not suspect our Author of any sinister designs of advancing Popery, but I will be bold to say he could hardly have taken a more effectual way, had he designed to do it, than by instilling into the minds of those who can look no further than his accounts such an odious character of those men, of whom so many thousands laid down their lives for the cause of true religion in those very points wherein Protestants stand distinguished from Papists at this day. I had once an occasion to make this same reflection in a former Book[60] on another writer[61], who is much superior to our Author in learning and ingenuity: and I never heard that he took it unkindly at my hands for so doing: for an historian's business is only to find out truth as well as he can, and then deliver it to others fairly without disguise or any false colours put upon it. And therefore I hope our Author will take occasion to amend this grand error, whenever he has opportunity to write any thing further upon this subject. His time would be much better employed in reading and considering the books of some of those excellent writers I have referred him to, than in collecting an heap of rubbish from Alexander Rosse or any other such injudicious writers.

3. But there is one thing more I must put this author and his readers in mind of: that whilst he bears so hard upon the poor Waldenses, and Albigenses, and Wicklevists, and Hussites, and Lollards, he has not one syllable in all his *Index* of the grand errors of the Romanists or Papists, under any title or denomination whatsoever. He cannot pretend they fell not directly in his way: for he treats of modern sects and heterodoxies as well as ancient. Neither did he want his guide here; for Alexander Rosse has a whole section of fifty pages in his book upon the subject[62]. Or if he had said nothing upon it, yet it might have become a new heresiologist to have taken notice of the errors of the Romanists upon some title or other. Their errors are as considerable and dangerous

60 Scholastical History of Baptism by Laymen, part 1. ch. 1. p. 97. [London, 1712. In the ninth volume of this edition, p. 85. Ed.]

61 [Jeremy Collier, Author of the Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain, &c. Lond. 1708–14. 2 vol. fol. Ed.]

62 [ΠΑΝΣΕΒΕΙΑ, or, A View of All Religions in the World, with the several Church-Governments, from the Creation to these Times. Also a Discovery of all known Heresies in all Ages and Places, &c. Lond. 1658. sm. 8vo. See n. 41, preceding. Ed.]

as those of most other modern sects; why then have they no place in the *Index?* Is transubstantiation no error? Is idolatry in its various species of worshipping saints, angels, images, relics, the host, and the cross, no crime? Is not the Hildebrandine heresy, as our writers style it, that is, *the doctrine of deposing kings*, an error worth mentioning? Nor the Pope's pretence to infallibility and universal power over the Church worthy of a Protestant's censure? Is it no crime to exempt the clergy from the power of the civil magistrate; nor any wrong done them to impose celibacy upon them? Have the people no injury done them in keeping the Scriptures locked up in an unknown tongue? or in being obliged to have divine service in a language they do not understand? or in being deprived sacrilegiously of one half of the communion? or in having the absolute necessity of auricular confession imposed upon them? Is there no harm in the use of interdicts and indulgences? Are private and solitary masses, and the doctrine of purgatory, with many other errors, such innocent things that it was not worth an historian's while to give his readers any notice of them or caution against them? Our Author knows I have fairly combated most of these things, and shown them to be novelties and great corruptions, in the several parts of my ORIGINES, as I had occasion to meet with them. Therefore the least he could have done had been to refer his readers to those parts of his own *Epitome*, or my *Origines*, where these things are treated, if he was not minded to give them in one view in his own collections.

But he is as favourable to the anti-episcopal men, or Presbyterians, as he is to the Papists. For he gives them no place in his catalogue neither. I suppose he was in haste for the press, and considered not that he had made such an omission. But he should now consider that he who falsely objects it to the Waldenses, 'that they rejected episcopacy,' which they always carefully maintained, should not have passed over in silence those men, who oppose episcopacy, when he might with justice and truth have charged them with it as their proper heterodoxy, from which their denomination of *Anti-episcopal*, or *Presbyterian* is taken. But this is not all the defect of his *Index*.

If this author would have given a perfect catalogue of *all* the original heresies from the first ages of Christianity, together with the more remarkable heterodoxies which appeared in these later times, he should have inserted many other names, both ancient and modern, which are now omitted in his catalogue.

In the first century, the *Thebulians, Cleobians, Dositheans, Gorthæans, Merinthians:* not to mention *Demas, Hermogenes, Hymenæus and Philetus, Alexander the coppersmith, Diotrephes, and the doctrine of Jezebel,* which are noted in Scripture.

In the second century, *Bassus,* a new disciple of Valentinus.

In the third century, the *Discalceati, Apocaritæ, Dicartitæ,* and *Solitarii,* which were new branches of the Manichees.

In the fourth century, the *Minæi, Adelphians, Psathyrians,* and *Lucianists,* two new branches of the Arians; *Adelophagi, Theoponitæ, Triscilidæ* or *Triformiani, Hydrotheitæ, Cyrthiani,* and *Pythecianí,* new sects of Arians; *Gyrovagi, Homuncionitæ, Ametritæ, Psychopneumones, Adecerditæ, Sarabaitæ* or *Remboth, Passionistæ, Nyctages, Theophronians, Metagenetæ, Sabbatians* or *Protopaschites.*

In the fifth century, the *Vigilantians,* and *Massilienses.*

In the sixth century, the *Marcianists,* or *followers of Marcianus Trapezita,* the *Tetraditæ,* and *Severians,* with the several branches that sprung from them, the *Contobabditæ, Paulians, Theodosians, Damianists, Petrites, Cononites, Corrupticolæ;* together with the errors of *Peter Moggus,* and *Peter Gnapheus* or *Fullo,* which made a great noise in the history of this age; as did also the practices of *Zeno* with his *Henoticon,* and *Anastasius* against the Council of Chalcedon.

In the seventh century, *Joannes Philoponus,* and *Ethicoproscroptæ.*

The eighth century was famous for the disputes between the *Iconoclastæ* and the *Iconolatræ, Image-worshippers* and *Image-breakers:* and the *Errors of the Second Council of Nice* might have been set forth in a much more advantageous view, had our Author been pleased to have acquainted his reader with the brave opposition that was made against it by the Council of Frankfort, and other Councils and writers of that and the following ages, in his 'History of the General Councils.'

The ninth and the tenth ages, Prateolus[63] is pleased to say, was 'a perfect interregnum of heretics, a cessation and rest of the Church for two hundred years and more from all heretical infestation.' Others more properly call these *the dark and ignorant ages, when the enemy sowed his tares whilst men were asleep.* And Baronius

63 [Gabriel Dupreau, Professor of Theology at Navarre, and an ardent opposer of Luther and Calvin. He died in 1588. See his *Elenchus Hæreticorum Omnium ab Orbe condito nostra usque ad Tempora. Colon.* 1605. *4to.* ED.]

himself[64] cannot forbear upon some accounts to call them, '*Infelicissima Romanæ Ecclesiæ tempora et omnium luctuosissima, the most unhappy and deplorable times of the Roman Church*, when weak men were in danger of being scandalized by seeing the abomination of desolation set in the temple.'

If our Author had been as inquisitive as it became him, he might have found the great idol of *transubstantiation* begun to be formed in the errors of Paschasius Rathbertus[65] in these ages, though not fully completed until some ages after in the Council of Lateran, [anno 1215,] and in the seeds of the Hildebrandine heresy, springing up in the bold attempts of the Popes of these ages against the power of princes, until it came to its full maturity under Hildebrand himself, called *Gregory VII.*: to mention no more of the Popish errors, which our Author thought fit wholly to pass over.

In the twelfth century he might have found the errors of *Durandus de Waldech*, and *Petrus Abælardus*, and *Gilbertus Porretanus*, and the *Coterelli*, and the *Populicans*, to have added to his *Index*.

But above all, the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries would have furnished him with great abundance of more remarkable errors to have filled up his catalogue, instead of the Wicklevites, and Hussites, and Waldenses, and Albigenses. For now appeared in the thirteenth century the errors of *Abbot Joachim*, and *Petrus Joannes de Oliva*, and *John de Parma*, the author of the infamous book called *Evangelium Æternum, The Everlasting Gospel*, which was to supersede and set aside the Gospel of Christ, under pretence of introducing the more spiritual Gospel of the Holy Ghost. Eimericus[66] has noted seven and twenty errors and blasphemies contained in this book, which the Mendicant Friars in those days highly magnified.

But our Author needed not to have gone so high as Eimericus for them: for Bishop Stillingfleet gives an ample account of them in his

64 [Vid. Ad annum 897. n. 4. (Ed. Lucæ, 1744. t. 15. p. 487.)—Conf. ibid. n. 6. (p. 488.) Sed redeamus ad Stephanum, quem non audirem inter Romanos pontifices numerare, nisi id factum a majoribus invenissem, utpote tanto indignum nomine; &c. Ed.]

65 [Abbas Corbeiensis, floruit (anno 820) tempore Paschalis Papæ Prima et Ludovici Imperatoris. Scripsit insignem librum de Corpore et Sanguine Domini, qui exstat in Bibliotheca SS. Patrum, tom. 6. editionis secundæ, &c. Bellarmin. de Scriptor. Eccles. p. 150. Ed. Colon. 1684. 4to.—See the Tract also in the eighth volume of the Bibliotheca Maxima, Lugdun. 1677. Ed.]

66 [An inquisitor in the earlier part of the fifteenth century. See p. lxxvi, following. Ed.]

Fanaticism of the Church of Rome[67]; as he does also of the errors of *Gerardus Segarelli*, and the *Dulcinists*, and *Herman of Ferraria*, and the book called, *The Flowers of St. Francis*; and another, *The Conformities of St. Francis and Christ*. To which may be added the errors of *Raymundus Lullius*, and *David Dinantius*, and *Bugaurius de Monte Falcone*, together with the errors of *Joannes Guion*, and *Joannes de Mercuria*, and *Nicolas de Ultricuria*, and *Dionysius Soulechat*, a Franciscan, and *Joannes de Calore*, and one *Ludovicus*, and *Guido*, an Austin hermit; with some others that were condemned in these ages by Guilielmus Parisiensis[68], and Stephanus Parisiensis[69], with the concurrence of the University of Paris, and are to be found at the end of some editions[70] of Peter Lombard, with the errors of Peter Lombard himself, under this title, *Articuli in quibus Magister Sententiarum communiter non tenetur*. Spondanus[71] adds to these, the *Condormientes*, and *Pastorelli*, and *Guido de Lacha*, and the *Humiliati*, and the *Ordo Apostolorum*: all which appeared within the compass of the thirteenth century, besides the famous disputes between the *Guelphs* and *Gibelins*, which continued in the following ages.

In the fourteenth century, there are the errors of *Arnaldus Montanerius*, and *Arnaldus de Villa Nova*, *Bertoldus de Roback*, *Martinus Gonsalvus Conchensis*, *Nicolaus Calaber*, *Bartholomæus Janovesius*, the *Bizochi*, and *Fratres de Paupere Vita*, the *Pseudapostoli*, *Joannes de Latone*, *Joannes Hato*, the sect of the *Impuri*, *Raimundus de Terraga*, *Amadeus Lusitanus*; the *Albati*, who travelled, with great admiration for their sanctity, over all parts of Europe; the *Templars*, whose order was extinguished in the Council of Vienne[72]; the *New Sabel-*

67 [In the Tract entitled, 'A Discourse concerning the Idolatry practised in the Church of Rome, &c.; wherein a particular account is given of the Fanaticisms and Divisions of that Church, Lond. 1671. 8vo. The second edition.' See also in vol. 5. of Stillingfleet's Whole Works, Lond. 1709–10. fol. ED.]

68 [He flourished about the year 1240. ED.]

69 [Stephen Templier, Bishop of Paris, later in the same period. See his *Rescriptum de quorundam Errorum et Librorum Damnatione anno* 1270 *et* 1277, *cum Rotulo Errorum Condemnatorum*, Biblioth. Max. Lugdun. 1677. tom. 25. pp. 329, seqq. ED.]

70 Vid. Ed. Lugdun. 1594. 8vo.

71 [Vid. ap. Continuat. Baron. ad an. 1199. n. 11. (t. 1. p. 11.) Item, ad an. 1233. nn. 11 et 12. (ibid. pp. 114, 115.) Item, ad an. 1251. n. 6. (ibid. p. 181.) I do not observe any express notice of the *Ordo Apostolorum*. ED.]

72 [The General Council of Vienne, *Vienna Allobrogum*, in Gaul, in 1311, under Pope Clement V. See Concil. Labb. et Cossart. t. 11. part. 2. pp. 1538, seqq. ED.]

lians of Spain, who maintained, upon the hypothesis of transubstantiation, *that the eucharist was both Father, Son, and Holy Ghost;* the errors of *Franciscus Ceccus*, an Italian astrologer; the wild disputes between the *Palamites* and *Joannes Cantacuzenus* on the one side, and *Barlaam* and *Acyndinus* on the other, concerning the light of Mount Tabor; the Revelations of St. Bridget and of St. Catharine for and against *the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary;* the disputes about the same matter between the Dominicans and the Franciscans; and the more fierce disputes of those orders concerning *the poverty of Jesus Christ;* of which Bishop Stillingfleet gives an ample account in his *Fanaticism of the Church of Rome* 73, and the author of the Mystery of Jesuitism 74, an account no less entertaining: add to these, *the errors of Pope John XXII.*, ninety of which are laid to his charge by our countryman, *Guilielmus Ockam* 75, for which he himself with his friends *Joannes Parisiensis, Joannes de Poliaco, Petrus de Vineis, Joannes de Janduno*, and *Marsilius de Padua*, with many others, are charged with heresy, being in reality firm to the defence of the imperial power against the papal. A Collection of whose Tracts may be found together in Goldastus's *Monarchia Imperii Romani; seu, De Jurisdictione et Potestate Imperatoris et Papæ, per varios Auctores.* Hanov. 1612. 3 tom. fol. 76

In the fifteenth century there are the famous disputes between the Councils of Constance and Basil on the one side, and the Council of Florence on the other, concerning *the infallibility and supremacy of the Pope above General Councils;* the error of the Council of Constance in *taking away the cup from the people:* the error of the Council of Basil in *determining for the immaculate conception.* There are also the errors of *Augustinus de Roma, Joannes Parvi, Franciscus Georgius Venetus, Laurentius Valla*, a reviver of

73 [See before, n. 67, preceding. Ed.]

74 ['A Discovery of the Mystery of Jesuitisme; in a Collection of Several Pieces representing the Designs and Practices of those who call themselves *The Society of Jesus.* Lond. 1658. 8vo.' Ed.]

75 [William of Occam, or Ockham, in Surrey, where he was born. He was a disciple of Duns Scotus, and became, when Fellow of Merton College, a renowned teacher in the School of Divinity, adopting the tenets of the Nominalists. He died in 1347. The work alluded to was entitled, *Defensorium contra Johannem Papam XIII.* See it in the *Fasciculus Rerum &c.* Lond. 1690. t. 2. p. 436. Ed.]

76 [In the *Index Auctorum* to the Antiquities the date is Hanov. 1609. et Offenbach. 1610. 3 tom. See v. 8. p. 257. No. 339. Ed.]

Sabellianism, *Nicholas Machiavel, Matthæus Palmerius, Petrus de Aranda, Fanatici Suevenses, Matthias Tiburtinus*, a Franciscan enthusiast, *Tympanista Germanus*, and a sect called *Opinionists*, not to mention *Henricus Harphius*, whose errors, because they are censured and expurged only by the order of the Roman Index, are of a more doubtful nature. There was also in the beginning of this age one *Vincentius Ferrerius*, a Catalonian preacher, who is now cried up as a great saint by Spondanus and Baronius, and other writers of the Roman Church: but there was a time when he was condemned as an heretic by Eimericus the inquisitor, for asserting, among other things, *that Judas repented unto salvation.* To which may be added the errors of *Quadrigarius* and *Munerius*, censured by the Sorbonne, anno 1442 and 1470.

The sixteenth century had but a little time before the Reformation was begun by Zuinglius and Luther: yet in this short interval our Author might have noted *Hermannus Rissuick*, and the *Fossarii* in Bohemia, and *Petrus Pomponatius* in Italy, who read public lectures *against the immortality of the soul.* And if he had added *Thomas de Vio*, commonly called *Cardinal Cajetan*, he would have had the authority of Prateolus and Ambrosius Catharin also, who wrote a book particularly against Cajetan, wherein he objects to him above two hundred errors, an extract of which may be found in Flaccus Illyricus, *De Controversiis Religionis Papisticæ*, (p. 138.) Basil. 1565. 4to.

We are now come to the age of the Reformation, where our Author has noted many sects and heterodoxies, but omitted abundance more that were very considerable.

Catharin, who condemned Cajetan, had also his errors noted by others. Sotomajor in his Index [77] prohibits some of his books to be read, and orders others to be expurged: but one may question whether that was done for his real errors, or only for his opinions inclining to the Protestant side. But his opinion of *an intermediate state after the end of this world, in a new earth between heaven and hell, for those who are neither so good as to be admitted into heaven, nor so bad as to be condemned to hell*, is an error that might have been worthy our Author's observation.

He speaks of the *Anabaptists*, (p. 5,) but with a great deal of confusion, whereas others distinguish them into at least *fourteen sects*,

77 [Index Librorum Prohibitorum et Expurgandorum Hispanicus. Madrit. 1667. Ed.]

according to their peculiar tenets, the *Muncerians*, the *Apostolici*, the *Separati*, the *Cathari*, the *Silentes*, the *Enthusiasts*, the *Liberi*, the *Adamitæ*, the *Hutitæ*, the *Augustinians*, the *Beuckeldians*, the *Melchiorites*, the *Georgians*, and the *Mennonists*. Some add to these the *Pastoricidæ*, the *Nudipedes*, the *Manifestarii*, the *Clancularii*, the *Baculares*, the *Batemburgici*, the *Pacifici*, the *Sanguinarii*. Our Author mentions some of these under their proper titles, but he omits the greatest part of them. And he ought to have distinguished our English Anabaptists from those of other countries, because they abhor many of their opinions.

In giving an account of the *Antitrinitarians*, he says, (p. 8,) 'they are the spawn of the old Arians and Samosatenians, grafted upon their stock by Michael Servetus.' Whereas Servetus was no Arian nor Samosatenian, but a reviver of Sabellianism, in which he was followed by Keckerman and many others, who never met with so severe a censure. The authors of modern Arianism were *Valentinus Gentilis*, and *Georgius Blandrata*, and *Gregorius Pauli*, and *Matthæus Gribaldus*, and *Franciscus David*, and *Joannes Paulus Alciat*, and *Joannes Campanus*, and *Lælius Socinus*, uncle to *Faustus Socinus*, of whom our Author should have given a particular account under their several titles. He should also have given some account of the errors of *Julius Cæsar Vaninus*, and *Andreas Cæsalpinus*, and *Hobbes*, who were in the same class with *Spinosa*. It had also been worth his while to have told his reader what were the singular opinions or heterodoxies of *Archer* [78], who among other blasphemies maintained publicly in print, *that God was the author of sin*, for which he was censured by the Assembly of Divines, and his book burnt by the common hangman, anno 1645. He should also have noted the errors of *Jacob Behmen*, and *Antonietta Bourignon* [79], against whom Dr. Cockburn [80] wrote, and of *Hieronymus Cardanus* [81], and *Curcel-*

[78] [John Archer, for some time preacher at All Hallowes in Lombard Street. He was a Millenarian. I presume the heterodoxy lies in some part of that work of his which is now so very scarce, viz. *The Personal Reign of Christ upon Earth. In a Treatise, wherein it is fully and largely proved, that Jesus Christ with his Saints shall visibly possess a Monarchical State and Kingdom in this world, &c.* Lond. 1642. 4to. He also wrote *A Vindication of the Use and Advantage of Prayer*. Lond. 1731. 8vo. But I have not been able to examine either of these works. Ed.]

[79] [She advocated tenets similar to those of the Quietists. For a time she was countenanced by Fenelon: but eventually was forced to leave France, and died in Friesland in 1680. All her works were published at Amsterdam in 1686, in 19 vols. sm. 8vo. Ed.]

[80] [See his book entitled, *Bourignianism Detected: or, The Delusions and*

læus[82], and *Episcopius*[83], and *Arminius*[84]; and the errors of *Grotius*[85], after he fell into his designs of *comprehension*, and favourable interpretations both of the Popish and Socinian tenets, which plainly appear in his later writings: the errors also of the *Lord Herbert of Cherbury*[86]; the *new heresy of the Jesuits*, as the *Jansenists* themselves call it, which *asserts the Pope to be infallible not only in matters of faith, but matters of fact;* and *gives him power to dethrone princes and absolve subjects from their oaths of allegiance to them:* which doctrine every where occurs in the writings of *Bellarmin* against Barclay, and *Widdrington* under the name of *Sculkenius*, and in *Becanus*, and *Mariana*, and *Suarez*, and *Lessius*, and *Azorius*, and *Emanuel Sa*, and hundreds of others, some of whose books, together with *Baronius*, have been publicly burnt at Paris and Madrid by the hands of the common hangman.

To these might have been added *the new doctrine of the Jesuits in morality*, largely set forth in the books called *Provincial Letters* and *The Jesuits' Morals;* chiefly taken out of *Escobar*, *Filliucius*, and such other writers. As also *the doctrine of probability*, taught by *Caramuel*, which opens a way to licentiousness; for which he stands condemned and branded, even in the Roman Index, under this title, *Joannis Caramuelis Apologema pro Antiquissima et Universalissima Doctrina de Probabilitate prorsus prohibetur.*

There are also no less than forty-five propositions of *the Jesuits'*

Errors of Antonia Bourignon and her Growing Sect. Narratives 1 *and* 2. Lond. 1698. 4to.—Also, *A Letter giving an account why the other Narratives are not yet published.* Lond. 1698. 4to.—Dr. John Cockburn, the author also of a volume of Sermons, was Rector of Northaw in Middlesex. ED.]

81 [Born at Pavia 1501. Died 1576. His numerous works were published at Lyons in 1663 in 10 volumes, folio. ED.]

82 [Stephen Courcelles. Born at Geneva 1586. Died 1658.—Opera Theologica, Amstel. 1675. fol. ED.]

83 [A strict Arminian. Professor of Divinity at Leyden in 1612, &c. See the Index of Authors to the Antiquities, v. 8. p. 248. No. 264. n. q. ED.]

84 [Founder of the sect of the *Arminians* or *Remonstrants*. Born at Ondewater in 1560. Professor of Divinity at Leyden in 1603. Died 1609.—Opera Theologica, Francofurt. 1631. 4to. ED.]

85 [He died in 1645.—Opera Omnia Theologica. Lond. 1679. 3 tom. fol. in 4. —See also his *Epistolæ quotquot reperiri potuerunt. Amstel.* 1687. *fol.* ED.]

86 [A nobleman of admirable learning, but to be classed among deistical writers. Educated at Oxford. Raised to the peerage in 1631. Among other works, in his book *De Veritate, prout distinguitur a Revelatione, a Verisimili, a Possibili, et a Falso,* (Ed. tert. Lond. 1645. 4to.) he endeavours to prove the sufficiency of natural religion without revelation. ED.]

casuistical divinity, whereof this doctrine of *probability* is one, condemned by two bulls of Alexander VII., at the end of the Roman Index[87], which would have appeared well in our Author's collection. As also the censures of the Parliament of Paris and of the Sorbonne upon *the Propositions of Santarellus*, anno 1626, wherein he asserted *the Pope's deposing power:* the censure of the Sorbonne upon the Jesuits, anno 1661, for asserting *that the Pope has the same infallibility as Jesus Christ in matters of fact as well as right:* and the censure of the Sorbonne, anno 1561, upon another author for asserting *that the Pope has power to dispose of the dominions of heretical princes, and absolve their subjects from their oath of allegiance and fidelity.* All which may be found in the book called *The pernicious Consequences of the New Heresy of the Jesuits,* [*against the King and the State*[88].]

Richerius also gives us the censures of the Sorbonne upon one *Ludovicus Coubont*, for asserting *that bishops have not their authority immediately from Jesus Christ, but from the Pope:* and another upon *Ludovicus Cellotius*, for maintaining *that General Councils have their authority only from the Pope:* and another upon *Francis Guillon*, and a fourth upon *Jacobus Vernant*, for the same assertions; besides the censure of *Sanctarellus the Jesuit*, which is also there[89] related.

In another book of Richerius, *De Potestate Papæ in Temporalibus*[90], we have the arrests of the Parliament of Paris against *Tanquerel* and *Cardinal Petron*, and *Bernardinus Castorius*, for publishing the infamous Bull *In Cœnâ Domini*[91]; and against *Joannes Castellus*, and *Florentinus Jacob*, and *Ravaillac*, who murdered Henry IV. of France, upon *the deposing principles;* as also the arrests against *Bellarmin*, and *Martin Becanus*, and *Sculkenius*, that is, Bellarmin himself again, and *Suarez*, for their several pernicious books upon the

87 [Index Librorum Prohibitorum, Alexandri VII. Pont. Max. jussu editus. Romæ, 1667. 1 tom. fol. Ed.]

88 [Lond. 1666. 8vo.—For an ample list of works against the errors and machinations of the Jesuits, see the Bodleian Catalogue under *Jesuitism*. Ed.]

89 [Vindiciæ Doctrinæ Majorum Scholæ Parisiensis contra Defensores Monarchiæ universalis et absolutæ Curiæ Romanæ. Libellus de Ecclesiastica et Politica Potestate *, &c. Colon. 1611. 4to. Itidem, 1683. 4to. Ed.]

90 Colon. 1691. 4to.

91 [So called from its title and date: *Literæ Processus publicatæ die Cœnæ Domini anno* 1701. Clemens [XI] Episcopus. It is also termed *Pastoralis*, from its initial word. In this Bull the Pope excommunicates and damns all kinds of heretics. Ed.]

* [Great excitement was caused by this book, in which Richer maintains the authority of General Councils over that of the Popes. Ed.]

same subject. An account of which would have been a grace to our Author's catalogue of modern heterodoxies.

Further yet: if he had looked into Bishop Stillingfleet's book about *the divisions of the Roman clergy*[92], he might there have found, besides the schisms of the Popes in former ages, and their contentions with the Emperors for temporal power, and the feuds of the monastic orders one with another, *a particular account of the Jesuits' opposition to episcopal power and jurisdiction*, in the books of *Nicholas Smith* and *Thomas à Jesu*; which books were censured, first by the archbishop of Paris, then by the Sorbonne, and at last by the bishops of France in an assembly of them at Paris. To these he might have added the books which the Jesuits published under the feigned names of *Hermannus Leomelius*, and *Edmundus Ursulanus*, and the Jesuits' *Censure of the Apostolical Creed*, to ridicule the censures of Paris: and how these again were answered by *Hallier*, and *Le Maistre*, and *Petrus Aurelius*; who showed that these doctrines were maintained by the Jesuits: *That the episcopal order was not necessary to the being of a particular Church: that episcopacy was not by Divine right: that confirmation might be given without bishops: that the monastical order was more perfect than the episcopal:* and *that regulars were exempt from the jurisdiction of bishops.* And all that was done at Rome against these doctrines, was only to suppress the books on both sides; which the Parisian doctors highly complained of, 'that such scandalous and seditious books as those of the Jesuits should meet with the same favour at Rome as the censure of the bishops of France; that their profane and atheistical *Censure of the Apostles' Creed* must have no mark of disgrace put upon it, nor such sayings of theirs, wherein they call the bishops and divines of France by most contumelious names, and say, they are the enemies of truth and piety!

If our Author had looked a little further into Bishop Stillingfleet, he might have found how barbarously they used *Don Arnando Guerero*, bishop of the Philippine Islands, because he condemned them in a synod for acting independently of his jurisdiction; and the like usage of the bishop of *Angelopolis in America*, for the very same reason: and what horrible things are contained in their Catechisms which they gave to their new converts in China, which the Congregation *de Propaganda Fide* condemned in seventeen decrees at Rome, anno 1645. The short of their instructions was this: *To speak little*

92 [In the Discourse concerning the Idolatry of the Church of Rome, &c.—Lond. 1672 or 1676. 8vo. See also in the 6th volume of the Whole Works. Lond. 1710. Ed.]

of Christ crucified, but to conceal that small and inconsiderable circumstance of the Christian doctrine as much as may be: to use all the same customs that idolaters did, only directing all their worship to Christ and the Saints: not to trouble themselves about fasting, penance, confession, and participation in the eucharist, or the severity of repentance and mortification.

Are not these as pernicious errors as any that have appeared in these later ages, and were they not fit to be mentioned in an Account of Modern Heterodoxies? *Alphonsus de Varga*, a Spaniard, has four books under these titles against them[93]: 1. *Relatio ad Principes Christianos de Stratagematis* [Stratagematibus] *et Sophismis Politicis Societatis Jesu ad Monarchiam Orbis Terrarum sibi conficiendam.* 2. *Sedis Apostolicæ Censura adversus novam, falsam, impiam, et hæreticam Societatis Jesu Doctrinam nuper in Hispania publicata.* 3. *Jesuitarum Fidei Symbolum velut Canticum Novum.* 4. *Actio Hæresis in Societatem Jesu.*

But our Author has passed over many other modern heterodoxies worthy of a reader's information: such as the errors of *Dr. John Dee* and *Kelley* concerning *conversation with angels*, published by Meric Casaubon, London, 1659: the errors of *Thomas Monetarius* and *Christophorus Schaplerus*: the *Nicodemitæ*, written against by Calvin[94]: *Nicholas Drabitius*, a German enthusiast: *James Brocard*, an Apocalyptical prophet censured in the Protestant Synod of Rochelle, 1581[95]: *Paul Grebner*, a Swedish prophet: *Johannes Franciscus Borri*: *Bernardinus Ochin*, *Theophilus Aletheus*, and the book called, *Polygamia Triumphatrix*[96], *John Milton*, *Cornelius Vythagius*, and other defenders of polygamy and divorces: *Paionism*, censured by Spanheim in his Elenchus[97]: the errors of *Gulielmus Postellus*, *Père Simon*, the *Suenckfeldians*, *Vincentius Viviani*, an Italian fatalist, *Conradus Vorstius*, and the *Weigelians* and *Paracelsians*, called *the New Prophets of Germany*, an account of whose blasphemies may be found in Wendelin's Epistle Dedicatory to his Theology, and in Hoornbeck, Thummius, and Beckman, who have written particular books against them.

93 [These books appear to have been published without any name of place in 1626 and following years. Ed.]

94 [Excusatio de Pseudo-Nicodemos, &c. Vid. Tractat. Theolog. part. 2. chap. 2. Oper. Genev. 1617, &c. v. 15. p. 514. Ed.]

95 [See Quick's Synodicon, Lond. 1692. fol. Ed.]

96 [By John Lyser, a native of Saxony. See the *Index Autorum* to the Antiquities under *Polygamia, &c.* v. 8. p. 301. No. 619. Ed.]

97 [In the second volume (p. 725) of his Works, Lugd. Bat. 1701-2. fol. *Elenchus Controversiarum de Religione.* Ed.]

To these might have been added very properly an account of our late *New Prophets in England*, who made such a stir not many years ago; and the *Masonites* a little before them; together with the *Rationalists, Latitudinarians, Free-thinkers*, and *Unionists*, who pretend that the doctrines of Papists and Protestants rightly represented are in a manner all one; such were *Father Davenport*, otherwise called *Sancta Clara*, and *Mr. De Meaux*, Bishop of Condome, and such other reconcilers and expositors of the faith. The errors also of *Toland* and *Asgil*, and the book called, *The Rights of the Christian Church*, might justly enough have found a place in our Author's *Index*. So might also several sects of fanatics in the late confusions between 1640 and 1660. The *Vanists* or disciples of *Sir Henry Vane*; the *New Bemenists*, headed by *Dr. Pordage*: the followers of *Dr. Gell, Parker*, and *Gibbon*; *Lewis Du Moulin*, the *Levellers*, and many others, who are described in Edward's *Gangræna* [98], and *Reliquiæ Baxterianæ* [99], and other the like accounts of those times.

Our Author perhaps will now begin to think himself a little short and deficient in his *Short account of all the Principal Heresies since the rise of Christianity*: there being so many both ancient and modern, of which he has given no account, nor so much as named or mentioned. If he says it was needless; I say so too, with respect to the work he was about: but when he had undertaken it, he should have made good his pretence, and taken care that the book should have answered his title. But perhaps this could not have been done without writing a large volume upon the subject. Then he should have let it all alone, and his Epitome would have been both the cheaper and the better for it. His *indigent readers* might have known what ancient heresies were from St. Austin *De Hæresibus* more authentically, and also at an easier rate: for it is but a sixpenny book printed by itself at Oxford [1]: and for modern sects, they are nothing to the purpose of Antiquity, and therefore might have been omitted upon this occasion.

[98] [Thomas Edwards was an able writer among the Presbyterians. He died in 1647. The work alluded to was entitled, *Gangræna; or, A Discovery of many of the Errors, Heresies, Blasphemies, and Pernicious Practices of the Sectaries of this Time, vented and acted in England in these Four Last Years: as also, A Particular Narrative of Divers Stories, Remarkable Passages, Letters, and Extracts of Many Letters concerning the Present Sects, &c.* Lond. 1646. 4to. Ed.]

[99] [Or, *His Narrative of the Memorable Passages of his Life and Times* published by Matthew Sylvester, &c. Lond. 1696. fol. Ed.]

[1] [Oxoniæ 1631. 8vo. Item, Lugduni, 1562. 8vo. Genevæ, 1595. 8vo. Ed.]

As to his *History of the Eight first General Councils*, which runs to a great length, I think that as needless as the other. For the late worthy author of *The Clergyman's Vade Mecum*[2], in his Second Volume has given all such readers a perfect account of the Canons both of the Universal Code and the Roman Code, with the African Code, down to the year 787. Which I dare say is in the hands of most poor clergymen, before our Author in his great compassion thought fit to take pity on them. If he would have done any thing to the purpose, it should not have been *actum agere*, but to have given them a short account of those Latin Councils, which the foresaid author does not concern himself with, but are frequently used in my ORIGINES. For which reason I have given an Alphabetical Chronological Index[3] of them, being about an hundred and twenty in all, together with the number of canons contained in them: which is enough to answer the end of my undertaking.

I have supplied the whole also with a general Index of Matter[4], referring distinctly to every particular volume, book, chapter, section and page throughout the whole: and added a Catalogue of such Authors as I have made use of in compiling the work from first to last. I had also some thoughts of adding another Index *of such authors as I have had no opportunity to see or use, which yet may be of great use to those who are minded to improve this study of Church Antiquities further*: but because this gentleman calls me to a repetition of my labours, and obliges me to be my own epitomizer,—

Donatum rude reposcit,
Atque iterum antiquo tentat me includere ludo,—

I will reserve this for a more proper occasion: wishing the reader in the mean time as much pleasure, satisfaction, and advantage in reading without labour, as I have had with a mixture of great labour in compiling and digesting, these collections.

2 [John Johnson, Vicar of Cranbrook in Kent in 1707. A Non-Juror in principle in his later years. The full title of his *Vade Mecum* is as follows:— *A collection of all the ecclesiastical laws, canons, answers, or rescripts, with other memorials concerning the government, discipline, and worship of the Church of England, from its first foundation to the Conquest, that have hitherto been published in the Latin and Saxon tongues; and of all the Canons and Constitutions Ecclesiastical, made since the Conquest and before the Reformation, that have hitherto been published in the Latin tongue. Now first translated into English, with explanatory notes, and such glosses from Lyndwood and Athone as were thought most useful.* Lond. 1720, 2 vol. 8o. ED.]

3 [See this remodelled and placed next after the *Index Auctorum* in the eighth volume of this edition, p. 335. ED.]

4 [Much enlarged and improved in this edition, and following the *Indices* of Authors and Councils at the end of the same volume. ED.]

POSTSCRIPT.

For the further improvement of Ecclesiastical Antiquity, if any vigorous young men, of learning, application and good judgment, are minded to employ themselves that way, these following works may be proper to be undertaken by such as have opportunity of books and leisure, especially in the Universities.

1. *A supplement to my Origines in a book of Miscellaneous Rites:* which, if God should be pleased to give me better health, I should be glad to pursue myself, though I think it now the least part of what is wanting.

2. *A Catholic Comment upon the Scriptures:* which is already begun, and carried on by a learned and diligent writer [5].

3. *A body of Catholic Divinity in the words of the ancient writers:* such as the *Theologica Dogmata* of Petavius[6] the Jesuist, and Thomasin[7] the Oratorian, among the Romanists.

4. *A body of Practical or Moral and Casuistical Divinity:* of which I have had occasion to do a little, so far as relates to the great crimes against the Ten Commandments [8], which fell under the discipline of the Church. But a complete work in this kind, extending to all virtues and vices, and practical cases of all sorts, would be much more diffusive, and of excellent use for direction of preachers and casuists upon all moral questions.

5. *An authentic edition of the Canons of the Councils, Greek and Latin, in their originals:* for translations and epitomes, though they are of some use to the unlearned, are not satisfactory to men of true learning and judgment, who will always have recourse to

[5] [The Rev. William Lowth, M.A., prebendary of Winchester in 1696, and Rector of Buriton, Hants, in 1699. Died 1732. The father of Dr. Robert Lowth, Bishop of London in 1777. He wrote *A Commentary on the Prophets*, which was first published, London, 1714, in 4 vols. 4to. My Ancestor and Mr. Lowth were intimately acquainted with each other. ED.]

[6] [Paris. 1614–1650, 4 tom. fol. This work is full of choice erudition; but it is to be regretted that Petavius did not complete his design. Muratori regards him as the restorer of dogmatic theology. The enlarged and best edition of the *Opus de Dogmatibus, &c.*, was published at Venice in 1757, in seven vols, folio. ED.]

[7] [Joseph Maria Thomasi. He was one of the principal expounders and illustrators of the liturgy and ceremonials of the Church. He became a cardinal in 1712. The complete and best edition of his whole works was brought out by Vezzosi at Rome in 1747, 7 tom. 4to. ED.]

[8] [Forming the sixteenth Book of the Antiquities. Reproduced in the sixth volume of this edition. ED.]

originals. Dr. Allix[9] once undertook this work, and had very particular favour shown him by the Parliament in granting him foreign paper without duty, as I have been informed, and yet the design by some means or other proved abortive. The Acts of the Councils, which are different from the Canons, are much too long to be inserted in such an edition: but the Canons themselves may be comprised, in the original Greek and Latin, in two moderate volumes in quarto. Which would be exceeding useful to scholars of a moderate fortune, to have the valuable part of the voluminous tomes of the Councils, twenty or thirty in number, brought to their hand in an authentic manner, and at a very easy rate: whereas now such editions of the Councils as Labbe's, are scarcely to be found throughout a whole diocese, except in the Cathedral Libraries or some Collegiate Church, where few, that have inclination, can have access to them without both labour and expense, except such as are placed conveniently in the next neighbourhood[10], as it pleased Providence to place me; without which happiness I had never had ability to have gone through any part of the work, which now, by the blessing of God, I have lived to finish.

6. *The History of the Persecutions and Sufferings of the Primitive Martyrs, extracted out of their authentic Acts, and approved Historians, without the spurious additions of nauseous legendary writers, and the uncertain martyrologists of later ages.* I once made some attempt toward this myself, and read many parts of it for a year or two, as useful afternoon exhortations to zeal and constancy in religion, in my parish-church. But other employments made me lay it aside, and leave it imperfect. Mr. Ruinart's *Acta Martyrum Sincera*[11], and Pagi's *Critica* upon Baronius[12], will be of particular use to any one who is minded to set about such a work afresh, and bring it to perfection. So will also the books of Meisner, Kortholt, and Gallonius, which Dr. Cave, in the *Prolegomena* [to his *Historia Litera-*

9 [Who, withdrawing from France to England upon the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, became Canon of Windsor and treasurer of Salisbury Cathedral. He was one of the ablest theologians of his era. He died in 1717. Ed.]

10 [Headbourn-Worthy, and thus enabling him to reside at Winchester. This is a further proof of the ample use he made of Dr. Morley's Library at the Cathedral. Ed.]

11 [Acta priorum Martyrum sincera et selecta; ex Libris cum editis tum manuscriptis collecta, &c. His præmittitur Præfatio Generalis, in qua refellitur Dissertatio Undecima H. Dodwelli de Paucitate Martyrum. Editio secunda, ab ipso Auctore recognita, &c. Amstel. 1713. fol. Ed.]

12 [Either separately, Paris 1689, or Antwerp 1705. 4 tom. fol. Also in the largest and best edition of Baronius, Lucæ 1738–57, 38 tom. fol. Ed.]

ria, (v. 1, p. 27,) according to the edition of 1698,] recommends to men's use upon this subject. Mr. Dodwell's Twelfth Dissertation upon St. Cyprian is an excellent discourse to set forth the causes of the courage of the primitive martyrs: but the Eleventh Dissertation, *De Paucitate Martyrum*, serves for no other end, but only to show what a great man can say upon a bad cause, and argue plausibly upon a very slender and false foundation, which the undertaker of this work is to beware of, and consider well what Ruinart has said against it.

7. *The History of Heresies, Heterodoxies, and Schisms:* which, after all the attempts that have been made upon it, has never been done to any tolerable satisfaction or perfection. Dr. Cave tells his reader the names of the common authors that have written upon it: but he concludes after all in these remarkable words [13]: *His tamen aliisque plurimis, qui addi poterant, non obstantibus, opus accuratum de Hereticis, præcipue antiquis, deque eorum ortu, progressu, affinitate, dogmatibus, duratione, merito adhuc inter desiderata habendum est.* And I believe the remarks which I have now made upon one of the last authors of this kind, is a pretty good evidence of the truth of his observation. I could say a great deal more upon this subject, but what I have already hinted is sufficient to a wise undertaker.

8. And lastly, *A Supplement to those two great and incomparable writers, Dr. Cave and Du Pin;* who have given the world such an excellent account of ecclesiastical writers. Nothing hardly can be so perfectly done in this kind, but that still considerable additions may be made to it. The world has expected for some time a third volume [14] of Dr. Cave's, and that perhaps might supersede all other men's labours: but till that appears, I can be bold to say, there are many authors lie hid from ordinary view: and that is enough to hint this as a subject capable of further improvement: but there would be another use also in it, to bring to light the knowledge of several historians and other writers, whose testimony would give confirmation to the Protestant cause, against the corruptions of the Romish Church in later ages.

13 [See his Prolegomena, sect, 8. n. 6. Ed. Oxon. 1740. t. 1. Prolegom. p. 39. Ed.]

14 [I do not find any intimation of the kind in Dr. Cave's Prefaces or Prolegomena. Doubtless such an addition would have perfected his work, which, with his last improvements and Wharton's *Auctarium*, is invaluable as it is. Possibly had Cave lived a few years longer, those materials of which Wharton, the Doctor's amanuensis, availed himself, would have formed the basis of the third volume so generally looked for by the public. Ed.]

And now that I have mentioned this, I will add two or three things more that would be of great advantage to the Church, if they were done by persons of care and judgment, though they have no relation to antiquity.

1. *An Account of the Roman Indexes of Prohibited and Expurged Books, shewing the reasons for which the Inquisitors so carefully prohibit or expurge them.* I am sure by this means a good collection or catalogue of witnesses for the truth, against the manifest corruptions of the Romish Church might be extracted out of the confessions of her own writers.

2. *A New Work of short Marginal Annotations on the Bible, explaining only the most obvious difficulties that seem to puzzle ordinary readers.* The learned have Annotations abundantly enough to serve their turn: but there seems still to be something wanting of this kind for ordinary readers. I have sometimes put learned friends upon this work, who perhaps were otherwise usefully employed: and if I myself had not had the same plea, I would have attempted something of this nature for the benefit of inferior people, who are allowed to read the Scriptures, and yet many times want proper helps to understand them: which would be remedied very often, either by giving a little turn and light to the translation, or explaining some obscure phrase, or some ancient custom, upon which the understanding of the text many times depends, with other such ways of accommodating the Scripture to the capacities of the vulgar.

3. Till this were effected, *A short Exposition of those Chapters only, which are read as Proper Lessons out of the Old Testament,* might be a proper help to vulgar capacities and ordinary readers, to employ their meditations upon those parts of Scripture, which the Church has chosen for their edification and instruction, and seem most to want some light and guide, to make them answer that end to them. If I am not mistaken, I have seen such a work of Bishop Cooper's [15] in former times: but be it his or any other's, I believe a thing of this kind judiciously done would generally be allowed to be an useful work, for the end it is proposed and in-

[15] [Dr. Thomas Cooper: translated from Lincoln to Winchester in 1584. 'He was,' says Wood, 'furnished with all kind of learning, almost beyond his contemporaries, and not only adorned the pulpit with his sermons, but the commonwealth with his writings.' The work to which my Ancestor alludes is entitled,—*A Brief Exposition of such Chapters of the Old Testament as usually are read in the Church at Common Prayer on Sundays throughout the year.* Lond. 1573. 4to. Ed.]

[illegible] We should indeed with pains be experienced on the Epistles and Gospels, and large commentaries on the Old and New Testament; and these most excellent I have mentioned are much more needed, and that a stranger to recommend the work to a pious undertaker.

The great objection against all these things is, that each of them is too great an undertaking for any single man. I remember to have heard of the same objection made by some against me and my Commentaries upon publishing the first volume of them. I bless God, I have lived to outlive the objection, and given the world a proof that great and laborious works are not always as frightful as sometimes they are imagined. I have given a little specimen of what the industry of a single person may do, in whom there is neither the greatest capacity nor the strongest constitution; and, having made the experiment myself, I can with more decency and freedom recommend these things to others, who are qualified to undertake them. But in saying this, I would not encourage every bold empiric in divinity or history, to set about such works, which they are not any ways qualified for, either for want of knowledge or want of judgment. To all such the poet's direction is much more proper,—

> Sumite materiam vestris, qui scribitis, æquam
> Viribus, et versate diu quid ferre recusent,
> Quid valeant humeri :——

the want of observing which rule does abundantly more harm than good. For such men's writings only serve to confound learning, and leave things in a much worse state than they found them. The world has daily experiment of this, to the prejudice both of good literature and religion. Therefore what I have said by way of encouragement is not to these, but to the truly judicious, the inquisitive, the modest, and the learned, who want nothing but courage proportionable to their understanding, to make them become great instruments of God's glory in doing useful things for the service of his Church. This Church has never wanted such brave spirits, and I hope never will, to set forth truth with all the advantages of learning, and confound the opposition that is made to it by all the enemies of religion, whether they be the more professed attackers, or the secret underminers of its foundation.

The blessing of God be upon all those who have ability and will to undertake great and useful works for the promotion of piety and religion, and to stand in the gap against all the enemies of truth.

XI.

ANOTHER ORIGINAL PREFACE.

[Prepared by the Author for an intended second edition of his third volume, which was first published in 1711, but which design appears to have been laid aside before the fourth volume came out in 1715, being postponed probably till after the completion of the whole work in 1722, and not then effected in consequence of the Author's death in 1723.]

IT has ever been the earnest desire and hearty wish of all pious and good men since the Reformation, to see all Protestant Churches united, as well in one common form of government and discipline, as in matters of doctrine: to which purpose several learned and judicious persons have occasionally offered their private thoughts and schemes in a pacificatory way, as the proper means of union and accommodation. The French Synods had once this matter under their consideration [1], and made some proposals for drawing up a General Confession of Faith of necessary points only, so as all Churches might be induced to subscribe it. And herein they had the encouragement of King James, and some other Protestant princes; but, whether it was by the stiffness of the Lutherans, or what other reason, I know not, the design at last proved abortive.

However, Mr. Duræus [2] revived the same design; for good men

[1] See Quick's Synodicon Galliæ Reformatæ, (Lond. 1692.) Synod of Tonneins, anno 1614, ch. 18.

[2] [John Dury, or Duree, born and educated in Scotland. In 1624, when quite a young man, he visited Oxford for the sake of the Libraries there. The great object of his Life was to be instrumental in uniting the Lutherans and the Calvinists. He was much encouraged by Archbishop Laud, and Bishops Bedell and Hall, as he himself tells us. His first chief efforts were as early as 1624, nor was he deterred by the little success he met with even as late as 1661, as he assures the reader in his *Irenicorum Tractatuum Prodromus*, Amstel. 1661-2. 8vo. A long list of his writings may be found in the Bodleian Catalogue, and among them *A Petition to the House of Commons, whereunto are added Certain Considerations shewing the Necessity of a Correspondence in Spiritual Matters between all Protestant Churches.* Lond. 1642. 4to. ED.]

never wholly despair of effecting that which is for the general interest of God's Church; since what miscarries at one time may, by the direction and disposal of Providence, meet with a more favourable acceptance at another. But his endeavours, though countenanced and encouraged by several excellent and learned men, met with no better success than the former.

Yet this did not discourage others from attempting the same thing again: for Dr. Heidegger, a late eminent professor at Zurich, has since published two elaborate Dissertations[3] upon the same subject, wherein he first examines the nature and moment of the points in debate between the contending parties, and then offers a variety of arguments to show both the reasonableness and feasibility of an union betwixt the two Churches.

Some crowned heads also have interposed their good offices and authority to promote so worthy and excellent a design; and though the success has not fully answered their endeavours, yet hence it is clear that pious men in every age not only lament the sad divisions of the Church, but think it their duty to propose and set forward pacificatory methods of accommodation.

With this mind and intention, a late excellent primate of Ireland, Archbishop Usher, foreseeing the troubles that were likely to fall upon the Church of England by the disputes that were raised here about church-government in the year 1641, wrote that pacificatory tract, called *Episcopal and Presbyterial Government conjoined; or, The Reduction of Episcopacy unto the Form of Synodical Government, received in the Ancient Church, &c.*[4]; wherein he endeavoured at once to preserve the just rights and species of the primitive episcopacy, and yet give satisfaction to all reasonable men of the Presbyterian party, by making a proposal to set up suffragan bishops, in imitation of the ancient *chorepiscopi*, in every rural deanery throughout the nation, who should be obliged to act in concert with the respective presbyteries, or synods of incumbent pastors in every deanery, which should be assembled every month for that purpose: by which means the great complaint of want of discipline

[3] De Pace Protestantium Ecclesiastica. Amstel. 1687. 8vo. [John Henry Heidegger was born near Zurich in 1633, and died in 1698. He was successively Professor of Hebrew and Philosophy at Heidelberg, of Divinity and Ecclesiastical History at Steinfort, and of Morality and Divinity at Zurich. The work alluded to above was one of the latest from his pen. Ed.]

[4] [*Proposed in the year* 1641, *as an expedient for the prevention of those troubles, which afterwards did arise about the matter of Church-government.* To be found at p. 527. of the twelfth volume of Usher's Whole Works, Dublin, 1847, &c. Ed.]

would have been sufficiently obviated, and the power of episcopacy and presbyteries amicably conjoined, and the distractions prevented which afterwards befell the Church. But nothing would content some designing men at that time less than the utter extirpation and destruction of episcopacy, as it appeared in effect afterward: so all proposals of peace that were made at such a juncture were frustrated by the iniquity of men, who had other ends in view more than the peace and settlement of the Church.

Now after such frequent disappointments of so many wise, and great, and learned men, in their motions for peace, it might seem a vain undertaking for any one to attempt a thing of the like nature for the future. But the times and seasons of God's providence in bringing things to pass are kept secret in his own power, and are utterly unknown to us till he pleases to discover them by the effect: the hearts of men are in his hands, and he turns them as the rivers of waters. He can make one generation kindly embrace what a former would not so much as endure to hear or think of; and sometimes he thinks fit to make use of weak instruments to bring mighty designs about, even after they have miscarried in the hands of others, whose power and reputation among men might, humanly speaking, almost have seemed to have promised and commanded success to attend them. Therefore, notwithstanding former disappointments, we are never wholly to despair of seeing the breaches and divisions of God's House made up again, but to exert our endeavours, as well as send forth our prayers, for the peace of Jerusalem, that it may please God in his due time of his great mercy to grant and effect it.

Upon this account, having treated largely in one of the following Books upon a certain head [5], which may prove a firm foundation for a solid peace and union between the two divided Churches of England and Scotland, whose differences at present about church-government and discipline seem to forbode no good to the nation or religion in general; I could not but in this place think myself obliged to offer a scheme, from the example and practice of the Primitive Church, which all wise and good men of both Churches may, perhaps, be inclined to think a very reasonable and Christian method of accommodation.

In one of the following Books [6] I have given a particular account

[5] [B. 9. chapters 2-7. v. 3. pp. 251-409. See also the *Conclusion* at the end of the eighth chapter, ibid. p. 422.

[6] See particularly throughout the second, third, and fifth chapters of the eighth Book, v. 3. pp. 251-323, and pp. 333-363.

of the largeness and extent of episcopal dioceses in the Primitive Church, and there fully evidenced, that as there were many vastly large and great, (such as we have some in England at this day,) so there were others very small in comparison, of no larger extent than the precincts of a Scotch *classis* or *presbytery*, or our English rural deaneries. Thus it was in Italy: in those provinces which were properly called *Italic Dioceses*, in contradistinction to those which were termed *Suburbicary* or *Roman Provinces*, the dioceses were generally large, twenty or thirty miles in extent; but in the other provinces nearer to Rome they were small and numerous. So that in those parts there were episcopal cities and sees not above five or six miles from one another; and in the compass of two hundred miles in length, and an hundred and fifty in breadth, there were above an hundred and forty dioceses, few of which were more than ten or twelve miles in extent, and some of them not half so much, as Narnia, and Interamnia, Fulginum, Hispellum, Forum Flaminii, and several others. I have made the same observation upon the dioceses in Palestine and Asia Minor [7], where there were four hundred dioceses, some of them of the largest size, as those in the northern and Pontic provinces; and others, in the southern or Asiatic provinces, as small as those of the Roman provinces, of which we have spoken.

Now this consideration, if calmly weighed by men of peaceable tempers, will open a fair way toward reconciling our present differences, and lay a solid foundation for a sincere union in point of ecclesiastical government between the two divided Churches: for as the Church of England is not without precedent for large dioceses in the practice of the Primitive Church; so neither will it be without precedent in the Church of Scotland to reduce her dioceses to the limits of a presbyterial *classis*, or *rural deanery*, some of which are of larger extent than many ancient bishoprics were: and then, if instead of a temporary moderator of a *classis*, a bishop be ordained to a perpetual office, to govern such a diocese for life, in conjunction and concert with the presbyters of the same precinct, as it was in the Primitive Church; I see not what more need be required to settle a primitive episcopacy among them. Nor can there be any just reason why the Scotch presbyters, if they will show themselves peaceable men and ready to hearken to fair terms of accommodation, should refuse such an episcopacy as this; which will still maintain the presbyteries in their full rights which they

[7] B. 9. ch. 2. s. 8. pp. 273–281, and ch. 3, especially the end of the first section p. 303. 'Now then supposing four hundred dioceses, &c.' Ed.]

anciently had, or even now have at this day; and will also answer any ends of discipline and government for which presbyteries can be pretended to be useful. For in such a small diocese as extends no further than the compass of a *classis*, or *a rural deanery*, the bishop may be able to visit parochially his whole diocese once or twice every year; and, with the assistance of his presbyters, hear and determine all matters relating to discipline which shall come before them. Or, to bring the government as near as may be allowed to the practice of the present presbyteries, according to Archbishop Usher's proposal:—

1. The rector or pastor of every parish, with the churchwardens and sidesmen, may every week take notice of such as live scandalously in that parish, and the pastor give them such admonitions and reproofs as are suitable to the nature of their offences, suspending the contumacious and impenitent from the communion.

2. The bishop may call a monthly synod of all the pastors in the diocese, where such delinquents as cannot be reclaimed by the admonitions of their private pastors may be presented to the synod and receive further admonition and censure from it; the bishop and presbyters concluding all things by common consent; so as the bishop may retain his authority by having a negative voice, that nothing could be concluded without him, and the presbyters also have their share in the government of the Church, that the bishop ask the consent of the major part of them; as some Protestant bishops have done both in their consistories and synods, and as was the practice of the Church in the days of Ignatius.

3. The bishops of the dioceses, which are now in being, may by these means retain their former dignity by being advanced to be metropolitans; for though their particular dioceses will be contracted by being divided, and having so many new ones taken out of them, yet they may retain the honour and privilege of primates over the inferior bishops, and so make the ancient dioceses become provinces, whereof they shall be the chief bishops or metropolitans, invested with power to call provincial or metropolitical synods, which may consist of all the bishops of that province, and such presbyters as shall be chosen out of every diocese to attend them.

4. By these means all those who are now archbishops will become patriarchs, and may have the privilege of summoning general or national assemblies, as reason or the necessity of affairs shall require, where all things may be determined which relate to the state of the Church in general. So the government of the Church will be, in a great measure, conformed to the state of the Primitive Church in

the third and fourth ages; which men of peaceable tempers will have no reason to find fault with, and it will be a happy way of compromising disputes about episcopacy, and putting an end to the divisions of the two Churches. This point once settled, other things will easily be adjusted by the prudence of the bishops and presbyters together, in whose hands the government of the Church will be lodged.

That which heretofore would have been a difficulty and an objection against having so many new bishops, because they would have been so many new spiritual lords privileged to vote in parliament, is already obviated and answered by the late civil union of the two kingdoms, by which not only the spiritual, but the temporal lords also have no further vote in parliament unless they be particularly chosen to it.

As to the power of nominating and electing these new bishops, which seems to be another difficulty, that may be put, as it was anciently, into the hands of the provincial synods, under whose regulation and conduct the clergy, and sometimes the magistrates and people of the place to which the bishop was ordained, were allowed to propose a fit person of the same diocese, one of the presbyters or deacons of the place, not a stranger, but one known to all the people, that there might be no just exception, nor even any insuperable prejudice conceived against him: of which method I have given a more particular account in a former treatise[8], where I speak of the elections and ordinations of the ancient clergy. But if any other method be thought more reasonable or agreeable to the state of the Scotch Church, it will be wholly in the power of provincial or national assemblies to appoint and determine it.

As to the business of ordination, there will no difficulty remain upon that account; for in the ordination of a presbyter, the presbyters may join in laying on of hands with the bishop, as was anciently the practice of the Primitive Church, and is now the practice of the Church of England: and in the ordination of a bishop, all the bishops of the same province may join with the metropolitan according to ancient custom.

Then for what concerns the use of a public Liturgy, or set Form of Prayer, that may be left either to the discretion of every single bishop and presbytery to appoint what form they please in their own church, or to provincial and national synods to determine: and so in all other cases of the like nature; for where Christian

[8] [See Antiquities, b. 4, ch. 2, throughout. See also ch. 3, s. 5. Ed.]

Churches are well agreed in the substantials of doctrine and government, their different rites and usages in matters of a more indifferent nature are not to create any disagreement between them.

But perhaps it may be thought by some, on the part of the Church of England, that the settlement of such an episcopacy in Scotland will be to the prejudice of the English Church and episcopacy as settled among us. To which I answer in general, than an episcopacy conformed to the model and practice of the Ancient Church, and which by its settlement seems most likely to tend to the quieting of all disputes and pacification of troubles upon solid principles of union, can never be to the prejudice of the English Church or episcopacy, but for the common good, by uniting the whole nation into one communion, which may be maintained, as the Catholic Church always maintained her union, notwithstanding any difference in the measure or extent of dioceses, or other variety in matters of outward administration.

If it be said, that the multiplying of bishops to such a number is without example in the Church, the reader needs only to consult what is said in a following Book [9] to give himself satisfaction to the contrary.

But it may be said, the countries where there were anciently so many bishops, as in the southern parts of Asia Minor, and in Italy about Rome, were very populous countries, and full of great cities, which were fit to make bishops' sees; whereas there are but few great cities in Scotland, and it would be against the ancient rules and canons of the Church to fix bishops in small cities and villages [10]. To which it is easy to reply, that those canons were never so absolute and necessary to be observed, but that when the Church thought it for her benefit and convenience to multiply bishoprics, they could easily be dispensed with. St. Austin erected a new bishopric at Fussala [11], a small town in his own diocese; and St. Basil did the same at Sasima [12], which, by Nazianzen's account of it, seems to have been but an inconsiderable place. In some countries, as in Arabia and Cyprus, there were bishops in villages [13], because

9 [B. 9, throughout. The Author's original third volume, for which this Preface was intended, contained Books 7, 8, and 9. Ed.]

10 [See Antiquities, b. 2. ch. 12. ss. 1, 2, 3. v. 1. pp. 145–150. Ed.]

11 [See ibid. b. 9. ch. 2. s. 5. v. 3. p. 258. 'St. Austin's diocese of Hippo, &c.' Ed.]

12 [See ibid. ch 3. s. 2. ibid. p. 305. .... 'And one of them, Sasima, of late erection, &c.' Ed.]

13 [See ibid. ch. 2. s. 6. pp. 265–267. See also ibid. s. 7. p. 271; and compare b. 2. ch. 12. s. 2. v. 1. pp. 145–147. Ed.]

it is to be presumed they had not cities enough for a convenient number of bishops to settle in. The largeness of a diocese is not always to be measured from the greatness of a city, but from the extent of the territory which is annexed to it: so that a bishop, whose see is but a village, may yet have business enough upon his hands, if he has a great many other towns and villages under the mother-village, and a large extent of jurisdiction. St. David's in Wales, we are told, is now no better than a village; far short of one of the villages of Arabia or Palestine, where sometimes ten or fifteen thousand people inhabited; and yet every one knows the diocese of St. David's is equal to the rest in Wales, if not superior to them. Perhaps if we knew the true state of all those cities which lay round about Rome, we should find many of them were not so very large, but that the territory which lay about them was generally the greatest part of the diocese; though both city and territory put together might not perhaps exceed the number of people in many of our rural deaneries. Where then can be the harm in following such a precedent, if we can regain the peace and unity of the Church only by reducing large bishoprics to the model of those ancient ones, when no other expedient can be thought of? Is it not better to have primitive bishops, though with less dioceses, than none at all? And to have episcopal men put into a capacity of doing their duty quietly again, than be forced to live in a state of perpetual persecution?

But some may think there may be danger in such a settlement, and that the erecting so many new bishoprics in Scotland will be a leading case for England, and bring our dioceses to the same model at last. It is impossible for any man to foresee what may happen in future ages: if the settlement be justifiable and good, and manifestly for the peace and welfare of the Church, we may safely trust Providence with the care of his Church having done our own duty to promote the benefit and advantage of it. Many ancient Churches lived in perpetual friendship and communion one with another, though their dioceses differed very much in extent: for in Asia Minor and Italy there were some of the largest as well as the smallest dioceses in the world[13], and yet we never read of any disputes raised about this: for the same species of episcopacy was preserved in them all; and so long as that was maintained, accidental differences made no disagreement among them. But admit the English Church should be reduced to the same model, all the harm

13 [See b. 9. chapters 3 and 5. vol. 3. pp. 300, seqq. pp. 333, seqq. ED.]

that befalls her thereby is only to change from one primitive model to another, to have a great number of bishops instead of a few; which is no ways disagreeable to the rules and practice of the Catholic Church; and I wish it were the worst design any enemy of the Church of England had against her.

But I am not pleading for any alteration of episcopacy where it is quietly settled, but for the introduction of it where it is lost: and if the method proposed should have its effect, I should think myself happy in being the meanest instrument of so good a work, which is so much for the glory of our religion, and the peace of this unhappy divided nation. The peace of the Church is what I must profess I have always at heart, and can be content to sacrifice any interest of my own in order to effect it; being little concerned upon this account, whether I please or displease any set or party of men, so long as I can promote the true interest of the Church and Religion in general.

But I am sensible the great difficulty of all is yet behind,—how to make this fair and honourable proposal take effect; which many will think utterly impracticable, because of the opposition it is likely to meet with in the Scottish nation, where the very names of *episcopacy* and *bishops* have heretofore been rendered odious among the common people. For my own part, I shall never despair of seeing honest and laudable designs take effect some time or other, so long as God's Providence overrules the world, and more especially intends the affairs of his Church. We have seen greater difficulties than this in many cases happily surmounted.

Staupitius[14] thought it was but a vain thing in Luther to offer at a reformation, and therefore he advised him rather to go to his study and pray for it, than fruitlessly to attempt it. But Luther's hopes were a little more sanguine: he thought it was better to join his prayers and endeavours together; and the event showed that he was not mistaken.

The Protestants in Poland were for a long time divided into three communions, viz. those of the Augsburg, the Bohemian, and Helvetic Confessions; their contentions were pretty warm and sharp, and had almost made them a prey, as well as a laughing-stock, to the common enemy: yet at last they happily united into one communion in the synod of Sendomir, anno 1570, where they drew up a General Confession, which they all could subscribe. It goes by

14 [John Staupitz, the author of a valuable book entitled *Von der Lieb Gottes ein wunder hübsch Underrichtung, bewart und approbiert durch Mart. Luther.* Basel, 1520. 4to. The Latin edition is dated at Francfort, 1624. 8vo. Ed.]

the name of the *Consensus Polonus*, and may be seen in the Harmony of Confessions[15]: and it is to this agreement, under the grace of God, that some wise men have ascribed the preservation of the Polish Churches.

To come a little nearer home. The late civil union between the two kingdoms[16] is a most pregnant instance to show, that great designs may be effected and brought about at last, after many former trials and disappointments, contrary to most men's expectations. The higher powers, we are told, had laboured at this work for a whole century together; but all in vain, till her Majesty[17] who now fills the throne, and seems to be set there for great and surprising enterprises, made it appear that Providence had reserved for her auspicious reign the effecting many things which her predecessors had attempted, but who had been always defeated in their designs. And why should we think it a more difficult or impracticable thing to compass an ecclesiastical union than a civil one, when the way lies so plain and open, and the method so fairly chalked out for the attainment of it? And there seems to be but this one thing wanting to make us the completest and most primitive Church on earth, and the happiest people under heaven; which blessing, if it can be once attained, will add to the victories and glories of the present reign: when it shall be said in future ages, that the same auspicious government and conduct, which vanquished our enemies abroad and restored the peace and liberties of Europe, subdued also our inveterate prejudices at home, and gently charmed those fierce disputes, which have been so frequently and fatally disturbers of the peace of former reigns. An ecclesiastical union, added to the civil, will be the strongest support and cement of what is already established; and whilst it unites us firmly in one common interest, it will be our best security both against the designs of evil men at home, who always labour to keep up divisions in the Church, that they may serve their own ends by them, and also render us more formidable to our enemies abroad, "yea, terrible as an army with banners."

15 [Cambridge, 1586. 12mo.—The book itself is entitled, *Consensus in Fide et Religione inter Ecclesias Majoris et Minoris Poloniæ, &c., primo Sendomiriæ* 1570, *deinceps Wlodislaviensi Synodo* 1583. *Accedunt Acta Synodi Toruniensis. Heidelberg.* 1605. 8vo. Ed.]

16 [First proposed to Parliament in 1702. The Bill for the Union finally received the Royal Assent in March 1706-7. Ed.]

17 Queen Anne. [This reference to that monarch makes it clear that this Preface must have been originally written before 1714, her Majesty having died on the first of August in that year: besides which, the Author's fourth volume, first published in 1715, is dedicated to George I. Ed.]

If any shall be so weak or ill-disposed as to suggest, that this union cannot be effected without breaking in upon the union already established, they may be pleased to inform themselves better, by considering, that the union now proposed to the Church of Scotland is not to be made matter of force, but to be their own voluntary act; not to commence by any law to require their compliance against their will, but to be matter of free choice, upon consideration of the benefits which will hereby accrue to both Churches and the whole nation. And we have now no reason to think, but that if men of piety and learning, and sober principles, and orthodoxy and charity, and men of a peaceable temper, are commissioned by our superiors to confer and treat of the means of union on both sides, they may be directed and influenced by God's Holy Spirit to fix upon such measures as will give satisfaction to both parties, and unite us upon this ancient Catholic model into one communion. For it is not now the name of *episcopacy* or *bishops* that is so frightful, as it was heretofore among them; since a late Scottish writer[18] has published a book to show, *that the Scotch ministers are not presbyters, but properly bishops.* Nor is it the real power and authority of bishops they are absolutely averse to; for *a classis* and *a moderator* assume the very same power as anciently a bishop and his presbytery did, only under different names, and upon unwarrantable grounds, making the office desultory, which was anciently fixed and perpetual in one person, and given to him by ordination, or imposition of hands and prayer, which were always the sacred and solemn rites of consecration to the episcopal office in the Catholic Church. Now, with how little alteration may the ancient episcopacy and primitive rules and practice be restored, and every thing made to run in its proper channel, if men are disposed to be peaceable, and to unite upon Catholic principles, which are reasonable terms of accommodation. I shall not need to urge arguments to persuade to this unity; the necessity of it to secure our affairs both in Church and State against the attempts of the common enemy seems sufficient to induce all reasonable men to embrace it; that, when we have conquered our enemies, we may not destroy ourselves, which has too often been the fate of this unhappy nation.

18 [Alexander Lauder, Minister of the Gospel at Mordentown. The following is the full title of his book: *The Ancient Bishops considered, both with respect to their Jurisdiction and Nature of their Power, in Answer to Chillingworth and others: wherein the conformity of the Government and Discipline of the Church of Scotland with that of the Ancient Church is fully manifested, and it is made evident that the Pastors of Parishes are not Presbyters but Bishops.* Edinburgh, 1707. 12mo. Ed.]

I pray God grant us all the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and knowledge, and of the fear of the Lord, that being endued with wisdom from above, "the wisdom which is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality and without hypocrisy," we may all see in this our day "the things that belong unto our peace, before they be hid from our eyes!"

[J. B.]

The Latin Prefaces of Buddeus and Grischovius are prefixed to the second volume of this edition.

CONTENTS

OF THE

FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD BOOKS

OF

THE ANTIQUITIES OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

BOOK I.

OF THE SEVERAL NAMES AND ORDERS OF MEN IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Of those titles and appellations which Christians owned and distinguished themselves by.

SECT. I. Christians at first called *Jesseans, Therapeutæ, Electi, &c.*, 1.—II. Christ called by a technical name ΙΧΘΥΣ, and Christians *Pisciculi* from that, 3.—III. Christians, why called *Gnostici* by some authors, 3.—IV. *Theophori*, and *Christophori*, 4.—V. Sometimes, but very rarely, *Christi*, 6.—VI. Christians great enemies to all party-names and human appellations. *Christian*, the name they chiefly gloried in, 6.—VII. Of the name *Catholic* and its antiquity, 9.—VIII. In what sense the name *ecclesiastics* given to all Christians, 10.—IX. The Christian religion called *δόγμα*, and Christians *οἱ τοῦ δόγματος*, 10.—X. Christians called *Jews* by the Heathen, 11.—XI. Christ commonly called *Chrestus* by the Heathen; and Christians, *Chrestians*, 12.

CHAPTER II.

Of those names of reproach which Jews, Infidels, and Heretics cast upon the Christians.

SECT. I. Christians commonly called *Nazarenes* by Jews and Heathens, 12.—II. And *Galilæans*, 14.—III. And *Atheists*, 14.—IV. *Greeks* and *impostors*, 15.—V. *Magicians*, 16.—VI. *The new superstition*, 17.—VII. *Sibyllists*, 18.—VIII. *Biothanati*, 18.—IX. *Parabolarii*, and *desperati*, 20.—X. *Sarmentitii*, and *semaxii*, 21.—XI. *Lucifugax natio*, 22.—XII. *Plautina prosapia*, 23.—XIII. Christians called *capitolins*, *synedrians*, and *apostatics*, by the Novatians, 23.—XIV. *Psychici*, by the Montanists and Valentinians, 24.—XV. *Allegorists*, by the Millenaries, 25.—XVI. *Chronitæ* by the Aëtians, *simplices* by the Manichees, *anthropolatræ* by the Apollinarians, 25.—XVII. *Philosarcæ* and *pelusiotæ* by the *Origenians*, 26.—XVIII. *The synagogue of Antichrist* and *Satan* by the Luciferians, 27.

CHAPTER III.

Of the several orders of men in the Christian Church.

SECT. I. Three sorts of members of the Christian Church; the ἡγούμενοι, πιστοὶ, and κατηχούμενοι, *rulers, believers,* and *catechumens,* 27.—II. The name *believers* strictly taken for the baptized laity, in opposition to the catechumens, 28.—III. Catechumens owned as imperfect members of the Church, 29.—IV. Heretics not reputed Christians, 29.—V. Penitents and energumens ranked in the same class with catechumens, 30.

CHAPTER IV.

A more particular account of the πιστοὶ or believers, and their several titles of honour, and privileges, above the catechumens.

SECT. I. Believers otherwise called φωτιζόμενοι, *the illuminate,* 31.—II. And οἱ μεμυημένοι, *the initiated,* 32.—III. And τέλειοι, *the perfect,* 32.—IV. *Chari Dei,* ἅγιοι, &c., 32.—V. The privileges of believers. First, to partake of the eucharist, 33.—VI. Secondly, to stay and join in all the prayers of the Church, 33.—VII. Thirdly, their sole prerogative to use the Lord's Prayer; whence that Prayer was called Εὐχὴ Πιστῶν, *the Prayer of Believers,* 34.—VIII. Fourthly, they were admitted to hear discourses upon the most profound mysteries of religion. All which privileges were denied to the catechumens, 34.

CHAPTER V.

Of the distinction of believers from rulers. Where, of the distinction observed in the names and offices of laity and clergy; and of the antiquity of these distinctions.

SECT. I. Believers otherwise called *laici, laymen,* to distinguish them from the *clergy,* 36.—II. The antiquity of this distinction in the names proved against Rigaltius, Salmasius, and Selden, 36.—III. The objection from 1 Pet. 5, 3. answered, 37.—A distinction in the offices of laity and clergy always observed, 38.—V. Laymen otherwise called βιωτικοὶ, *seculars,* 41.—VI. Also ἰδιῶται, *private men,* 41.—VII. What persons properly called *clerici,* 42.—VIII. The name *clerici* sometimes appropriated to the inferior orders, 43.—IX. The reason of the name *clerici,* 43.—X. All the clergy anciently called *canonici;* and the reason of it, 44.—XI. Also τάξις τοῦ βήματος, the order of the sanctuary, 45.

BOOK II.

OF THE SEVERAL SUPERIOR ORDERS OF THE CLERGY IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Of the original of bishops; and that they were a distinct order from presbyters in the Primitive Church.

SECT. I. What the Ancients mean by different orders of bishops and presbyters, 46.—II. The order of bishops always owned to be superior to that of presbyters, 48.—III. The order of bishops reckoned by all

ancient writers to be of Apostolical and Divine institution, 51.—IV. A list or catalogue of bishops ordained by the Apostles, 53.

CHAPTER II.

Of the several titles of honour given to bishops in the Primitive Church.

SECT. I. All bishops at first called *apostles*, 60.—II. After that *successors of the Apostles*, 61.—III. Whence every bishop's see called *Sedes Apostolica*, 62.—IV. Bishops called *princes of the people*, 62.—V. *Præpositi*, *προεστῶτες*, *πρόεδροι*, *ἔφοροι*, 64.—VI. *Principes sacerdotum, summi sacerdotes, pontifices maximi*, &c. 64.—VII. Every bishop anciently called *papa, father*, or *pope*, 65.—VIII. *Pater patrum* and *episcopus episcoporum*, a title given to others beside the bishop of Rome, 67.—IX. Bishops sometimes called *patriarchs*, 69.—X. All bishops styled *vicars of Christ*, 70.—XI. And *angels of the Churches*, 71.

CHAPTER III.

Of the offices of bishops, as distinct from presbyters.

SECT. I. A threefold difference between bishops and presbyters in the discharge of their office and function, 72.—II. First, in the common offices that might be performed by both; the bishop acted by an independent power, but presbyters in dependence upon and subordination to him, 73.—III. This specified in the offices of baptism and the Lord's supper, 74—IV. And in the office of preaching, 75.—V. Secondly, some offices never intrusted in the hands of presbyters; such as the office and power of ordination, 77.—VI. Instances of ordinations by presbyters disannulled by the Church, 79.—VII. Some allegations to the contrary examined. Where, of the difference made between the ordinations of schismatical bishops and those of mere presbyters, 80.—VIII. A third difference between bishops and presbyters was, that presbyters were always accountable to their bishops; not bishops to their presbyters, 83.—IX. Yet bishops' power not arbitrary, but limited by canon in various respects, 84.

CHAPTER IV.

Of the power of bishops over the laity, monks, subordinate magistrates, and all persons within their diocese; and of their office in disposing of the revenues of the Church.

SECT. I. No exemption from the jurisdiction of the bishop in the Primitive Church, 86.—II. All monks subject to the bishop of the diocese where they lived, 87.—III. As also all subordinate magistrates in matters of spiritual jurisdiction,88—IV. Of the distinction between temporal and spiritual jurisdiction: a bishop's power wholly confined to the latter, 89.—V. The bishop's prerogative in granting the *Literæ Formatæ* to all persons, 91.—VI. Of the bishop's power in disposing of the revenues of the Church, 93.

CHAPTER V.

Of the office of bishops, in relation to the whole Catholic Church.

SECT. I. In what sense every bishop supposed to be bishop of the whole Catholic Church, 94.—II. In what respect the whole world but one

diocese, and but one bishopric in the Church, 96.—III. Some particular instances of private bishops acting as bishops of the whole universal Church, 97.

CHAPTER VI.

Of the independency of bishops; especially in the Cyprianic age, and in the African Churches.

SECT. I. What meant by the independency of bishops one of another, and their absolute power in their own church, 99.—II. All bishops had liberty to form their own liturgies, 100.—III. And to express the same Catholic Creed in different forms, as to what concerned method or expression, 101.—IV. And to appoint particular days of fasting in their own churches, 102.—V. The independency of bishops most conspicuous in the African Churches; proved by several instances out of Cyprian, 103.

CHAPTER VII.

Of the power of bishops, in hearing and determining of secular causes.

SECT. I. Bishops commonly chosen arbitrators of men's differences in the Primitive Church, 105.—II. The original of this custom. Where, of the true meaning of those words in St. Paul, *τοὺς ἐξουθενημένους ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ*, 1 Cor. 6, 4. 106.—III. This power of bishops confirmed by the imperial laws, 108.—IV. Yet not allowed in capital and criminal causes; nor in any causes, but when the litigants both agreed to take them for arbitrators, 109.—V. Bishops sometimes made their presbyters and deacons, and sometimes laymen, their substitutes in this affair. A conjecture about the original of lay-chancellors, 109.

CHAPTER VIII.

Of the privilege of bishops to intercede for criminals.

SECT. I. Several instances of bishops interceding for criminals to the secular magistrates, 110.—II. The reason why they interceded for some criminals and not for others, 112.—III. That they never interceded in civil matters and pecuniary cases, 113.

CHAPTER IX.

Of some particular honours and instances of respect showed to bishops by all persons in general.

SECT. I. Of the ancient custom of bowing the head to receive the benediction of bishops, 113.—II. Of kissing their hands, 115.—III. The custom of singing *hosannas* to them sometimes used, but not approved, 115.—IV. What meant by the *corona sacerdotalis*, and the form of saluting bishops *per coronam*, 116.—V. Whether bishops anciently wore a mitre, 117—VI. Of the titles *ἁγιώτατοι*, *beatissimi*, &c., *most holy* and *most blessed fathers*, common to all bishops, 119.—VII. Bishops distinguished by their throne in the church, 119.

CHAPTER X.

Of the age and some other particular qualifications required in such as were to be ordained bishops.

SECT. I. Bishops not to be ordained under thirty years of age, except they were men of extraordinary worth, 121.—II. To be chosen out of the

clergy of the same church or diocese to which they were to be ordained, 124.—III. Some exceptions to this rule in three special cases, 125.—IV. Bishops ordinarily to be such as had regularly gone through the inferior orders of the Church, 126.—V. This to be understood of the orders below that of deacon; for deacons were qualified to be ordained bishops without being made presbyters, 128.—VI. In cases of necessity bishops chosen out of the inferior orders, 129.—VII. And, in some extraordinary cases, ordained immediately from laymen. The custom of going through all the orders of the Church in five or six days' time, a novel practice never used in the primitive ages, 129.

CHAPTER XI.

Of some particular laws and customs observed about the ordination of bishops.

SECT. I. Bishoprics not to remain void above three months, 132.—II. In some places a new bishop was always chosen before the old was interred, 133.—III. Some instances of longer vacancies in times of difficulty and persecution, 134.—IV. Three bishops ordinarily required to a canonical ordination of a bishop, 135.—V. Yet ordinations by one bishop allowed to be valid, though not canonical, 138.—VI. The bishop of Rome not privileged to ordain alone, any more than any other single bishop, 140.—VII. Every bishop to be ordained in his own church, 141.—VIII. The ancient manner of ordaining bishops, 141.—IX. One of the forms of prayer used at their consecration, 142.—X. Of their enthronement; their *homiliæ enthronisticæ* and *literæ enthronisticæ*, otherwise called *synodicæ* and *communicatoriæ*, 143.

CHAPTER XII.

Of the rule which prohibits bishops to be ordained in small cities and villages.

SECT. I. The reason of the law against placing bishops in small cities, 145.—II. Some exceptions to this rule in Egypt, Libya, Cyprus, Arabia, and especially in the provinces of Asia Minor, 145.—III. Reasons which engaged the Ancients sometimes to erect bishoprics in small places, 147.

CHAPTER XIII.

Of the rule which forbids two bishops to be ordained in one city.

SECT. I. The general rule and practice of the Church to have but one bishop in any city, 150.—II. Yet two bishops sometimes allowed by compromise to end a dispute or cure an inveterate schism. Where of the famous offer made by the Catholic bishops to the Donatists in the Collation of Carthage, 153.—III. The opinions of learned men concerning two bishops in a city in the Apostolical age, one of the Jews, and the other of the Gentiles, 156.—IV. The case of coadjutors, 157.

CHAPTER XIV.

Of the chorepiscopi, περιοδευταὶ, and suffragan bishops: and how these differed from one another.

SECT. I. Of the reason of the name *chorepiscopi*, and the mistake of some about it, 160.—II. Three different opinions about the nature of this

order. The first opinion, that they were mere presbyters, 161.—III. The second opinion, that some of them were presbyters, and some bishops, 161.—IV. The third opinion most probable, that they were all bishops, 162.—V. Some objections against this answered, 163.—VI. Of the offices of the *chorepiscopi*. First, they were allowed to ordain the inferior clergy, subdeacons, readers, &c., but not presbyters or deacons without special license from the city-bishop, 164.—VII. Secondly, they had power to minister confirmation, 165.—VIII. Thirdly, power to grant letters dimissory to the country-clergy, 165.—IX. Fourthly, they might officiate in the presence of the city-bishop, 165.—X. Fifthly, they might sit as bishops and vote in council, 166.—XI. The power of the *chorepiscopi* not the same in all times and places, 166.—XII. Their power first struck at by the Council of Laodicea, which set up περιοδευταὶ, or *visiting presbyters*, in their room. Their power wholly taken away in the Western Church in the ninth century, 167.—XIII. Of the attempt made in England to restore this order under the name of *suffragan bishops*, 168.—XIV. That suffragan bishops in the Primitive Church were not the *chorepiscopi*, but all the bishops in any province under a metropolitan, 168.—XV. Why the suffragan bishops of the Roman province were particularly called by the technical name, *Libra*, 169.

CHAPTER XV.

Of the intercessores and inventores in the African Churches.

SECT. I. The reason why some bishops were called by these names in the African Churches, and what their office was, 170.—II. Their office not to last above one year, 170.—III. No intercessor to be made bishop of the place where he was constituted intercessor, 170.

CHAPTER XVI.

Of primates or metropolitans.

SECT. I. The original of metropolitans, by some derived from Apostolical Constitution, 171.—II. By others, from the age next after the Apostles, 172.—III. Confessed by all to have been long before the Council of Nice, 173.—IV. Proofs of metropolitans in the second century, 174.—V. By what names metropolitans were anciently called, 176.—VI. In Afric they were commonly called *senes*, because the oldest bishop of the province, excepting the province where Carthage stood, was always the metropolitan by virtue of his seniority, 176.—VII. How the African bishops might forfeit their title to the primacy, and lose their right of seniority, 179.—VIII. A register of ordinations to be kept in the primate's church, and all bishops to take place by seniority, that there might be no disputes about the primacy, 179.—IX. Three sorts of honorary metropolitans beside the metropolitans in power. First, the *primates ævo*, 180.—X. Secondly, titular metropolitans, 181.—XI. Thirdly, the bishops of some mother-churches which were honoured by ancient custom, 182.—XII. The offices of metropolitans. First, to ordain their suffragan bishops, 183.—XIII. This power continued to them after the setting up of patriarchs in all places, except in the

patriarchate of Alexandria, 184.—XIV. The power of metropolitans not arbitrary in this respect, but to be concluded by the major vote of a provincial council, 184.—XV. Metropolitans themselves to be chosen and ordained by their own provincial synod, and not obliged to go to Rome for ordination, 185.—XVI. The second office of metropolitans, to decide controversies arising among their provincial bishops, and to take appeals from them, 186.—XVII. Their third office was to call provincial synods, which all their suffragans were obliged to attend, 188.—XVIII. Fourthly, they were to publish such imperial laws as concerned the Church, together with the canons that were made in councils, and to see them executed; for which end they were to visit any diocese, and correct abuses, as occasion required, 189.—XIX. Fifthly, all bishops were obliged to have recourse to the metropolitans, and take his *Formatæ*, or *Letters of Commendation*, whenever they travelled into a foreign country, 189.—XX. Sixthly, it belonged to metropolitans to take care of vacant sees within their province, 190.—XXI. Lastly, they were to calculate the time of Easter, and give notice of it to the whole province, 191.—XXII. How the power of metropolitans grew in after-ages, 192.—XXIII. The metropolitan of Alexandria had the greatest power of any other in the world, 192.—XXIV. All metropolitans called *Apostolici*, and their sees *Sedes Apostolicæ*, 193.

CHAPTER XVII.

Of patriarchs.

SECT. I. Patriarchs anciently called *archbishops*, 194.—II. And *exarchs of the diocese*, 194.—III. Salmasius's mistake about the first use of the name *patriarch*, 195.—IV. Of the Jewish patriarchs, their first rise, duration, and extinction, 197.—V. Of the patriarchs amongst the Montanists, 197.—VI. The name *patriarch* first used in the proper sense by Socrates and the Council of Chalcedon, 198.—VII. Four different opinions concerning the first rise of patriarchal power, 199.—VIII. The opinion of Spalatensis and St. Jerom preferred. Some probable proofs of patriarchal power before the Council of Nice offered to consideration, 201.—IX. Patriarchal power confirmed in three General Councils successively after the Council of Nice, 203.—X. The power of patriarchs not exactly the same in all Churches. The patriarch of Constantinople had some peculiar privileges, 204.—XI. As also the patriarch of Alexandria had his: wherein they both exceeded the bishop of Rome, 206. —XII. The powers and privileges of patriarchs. First, they were to ordain all the metropolitans of the whole diocese, and to receive their own ordination from a diocesan synod, 207.—XIII. Secondly, they were to call diocesan synods, and to preside in them, 208.—XIV. Thirdly, they might receive appeals from metropolitans and provincial synods, 209.—XV. Fourthly, they might censure metropolitans, and their suffragan bishops, if metropolitans were remiss in censuring them, 209.—XVI. Fifthly, they had power to delegate metropolitans, as their commissioners, to hear ecclesiastical causes in any part of the diocese, 211.—XVII. Sixthly, they were to be consulted by their metropolitans

in all matters of moment. A remarkable instance in the Egyptian bishops, 211.—XVIII. Seventhly, they were to notify and communicate to their metropolitans such imperial laws as concerned the Church, in like manner as the metropolitans were to notify to the provincial bishops, 212.—XIX. Lastly, the absolution of greater criminals was reserved to them, 212.—XX. The number of patriarchs throughout the world, reckoned to be about fourteen, answerable to the number of capital cities in the several dioceses of the Roman Empire: all which at first were absolute, and independent of one another, till Rome by usurpation, and Constantinople by law, got some of their neighbours to be subject to them, 213.—XXI. The patriarch of Constantinople commonly dignified with the title of *œcumenical*, and his church called *the head of all churches*: and that he was equal in all respects to the bishop of Rome, 214.—XXII. What figure the subordinate patriarchs of Ephesus and Cæsarea made in the Church: and that they were not mere titular patriarchs, as some in after-ages, 215.

CHAPTER XVIII.

Of the αὐτοκέφαλοι, or independent bishops.

SECT. I. All metropolitans anciently styled *αὐτοκέφαλοι*, 216.—II. Some metropolitans independent after the setting up of patriarchal power, as those of Cyprus, Iberia, Armenia, and the Britannic Church, 216.—III. A third sort of *αὐτοκέφαλοι*, such bishops as were subject to no metropolitan, but only to the patriarch of the diocese. These in the Greek *Notitiæ* dignified with the title, though they had not the power, of archbishops or metropolitans, 218.—IV. Valesius's mistake corrected, 219.

CHAPTER XIX.

Of presbyters.

SECT. I. The meaning of the name *presbyter*, 219.—II. Apostles and bishops sometimes called *presbyters*, 220.—III. The original of presbyters, as taken more strictly for the second order in the Church, 221.—IV. The powers and privileges of presbyters, 222.—V. Presbyters allowed to sit with the bishops on thrones in the church. Whence *ὁ ἐκ τοῦ δευτέρου θρόνου* denotes a presbyter, *one that sits on the second throne*, 222.—VI. The form of their sitting in a semicircle; whence they were called *corona presbyterii*, 224.—VII. Presbyters esteemed a sort of ecclesiastical senate, or council of the Church, whom the bishop consulted and advised with upon all occasions, 224.—VIII. Evidences of this prerogative out of Ignatius, Cyprian, and others, 225.—IX. The power of presbyters thought by some to be a little restrained in the fourth century, and not so great in some places as in the second, 228.

X. Yet still they were admitted to join with the bishop in the imposition of hands upon those that were ordained to their own order, 229.

XI. And allowed to sit in consistory with their bishops, 230.—XII. As also in provincial councils, 231.—XIII. And in general councils likewise, 232.—XIV. An account of the titles of honour given to presbyters, and how they differed from the same title as applied to

bishops, 233.—XV. In what sense bishops, presbyters, and deacons, called *priests*, 235.—XVI. Why priests called *mediators between God and men*, 238.—XVII. The ancient form and manner of ordaining presbyters, 239.—XVIII. Of the *archipresbyteri*, and that these were more ancient than the *cardinales presbyteri*, which some erroneously confound with them, 242.—XIX. Of the *seniores ecclesiæ*, and that these were not lay-elders in the modern acceptation, 244.

CHAPTER XX.

Of deacons.

SECT. I. Deacons always reckoned one of the sacred orders of the Church, 246.—II. Yet not generally called *priests*, but *ministers* and *Levites*, 248.—III. And for this reason the bishop was not tied to have the assistance of any presbyters to ordain them, 249.—IV. The first office of deacons to take care of the vessels and utensils of the altar, 250.—V. Secondly, to receive the oblations of the people, and present them to the priest, and recite publicly the names of those that offered, 251.—VI. Thirdly, to read the Gospel, in some Churches, 252.—VII. Fourthly, to minister the cup to the people, 253.—VIII. But not to consecrate the elements at the altar, 254.—IX. Fifthly, allowed to baptize, in some places, by the bishop's authority, 257.—X. Sixthly, to bid prayer in the congregation, 258.—XI. Seventhly, allowed to preach upon some occasions, 260.—XII. Eighthly, to reconcile penitents in cases of extreme necessity, 262.—XIII. Ninthly, to attend their bishops in councils, and sometimes represent them as their proxies, 263.—XIV. Tenthly, empowered to correct men that behaved themselves irregularly in the church, 264.—XV. Eleventhly, anciently to perform the offices of all the inferior orders of the Church, 266.—XVI. Twelfthly, to be the bishop's sub-almoners, 267.—XVII. And, lastly, to inform the bishop of the misdemeanours of the people, 268.—XVIII. Hence deacons commonly called *the bishop's eyes and ears, his mouth, his angels*, and *prophets*, 268.—XIX. Deacons to be multiplied according to the necessities of the Church: the Roman Church precise to the number of Seven, 269.—XX. Of the age at which deacons might be ordained, 270.—XXI. Of the respect which deacons paid to presbyters and received from the inferior orders, 271.

CHAPTER XXI.

Of archdeacons.

SECT. I. Archdeacons anciently of the same order with deacons, 273.—II. Elected by the bishop, and not made by seniority, 273.—III. Commonly persons of such interest in the Church, that they were often chosen the bishop's successors, 274.—IV. The archdeacon's offices; first, to assist the bishop at the altar, and order the other deacons and inferior clergy to their several stations and services of the Church, 275.—V. Secondly, to assist the bishop in managing the Church's revenues, 276.—VI. Thirdly, to assist him in preaching, 277.—VII. Fourthly, in ordaining the inferior clergy, 278.—VIII. Fifthly, the archdeacon had power to

censure the other deacons, but not presbyters, much less the archpresbyter of the Church, as some mistake, 278.—IX. What meant by the name *apantita*, and whether it denotes the archdeacon's power over the whole diocese, 280.—X. Why the archdeacon was called *cor-episcopi*, 281.—XI. The opinions of learned men concerning the first institution of this office and dignity in the Church, 282.

CHAPTER XXII.

Of deaconesses.

SECT. I. The ancient names of deaconesses διάκονοι, πρεσβύτιδες, *viduæ*, *ministræ*, 284.—II. Deaconesses by some laws required to be widows, 285.—III. And such widows as had children, 286.—IV. To be sixty years of age, 287.—V. And such as had been only the wives of one man, 288.—VI. Deaconesses always ordained by imposition of hands, 289.—VII. Yet not consecrated to any office of the priesthood, 292.—VIII. Their offices, first, to assist at the baptism of women, 294.—IX. Secondly, to be a sort of private catechists to the women-catechumens, 295.—X. Thirdly, to visit and attend women in sickness and distress, 295.—XI. Fourthly, to minister to the martys in prison, 295.—XII. Fifthly, to keep the women's gate in the church, 296.—XIII. Lastly, to preside over the widows, &c., 297.—XIV. How long this order continued both in the Eastern and Western Churches, 297.—XV. Another notion of the name *diaconissa*, in the middle ages of the Church, in which it signifies *a deacon's wife*, as *presbytera* does *a presbyter's wife*, and *episcopa a bishop's wife*. The contrary errors of Gentiletus and Baronius about these corrected, 299.

BOOK III.

OF THE INFERIOR ORDERS OF THE CLERGY IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Of the first original of the inferior orders, and the number and use of them; and how they differed from the superior orders of bishops, presbyters, and deacons.

SECT. I. The inferior orders not of apostolical but only ecclesiastical institution, proved against Baronius and the Council of Trent, 301.—II. No certain number of them in the Primitive Church, 305.—III. Not instituted in all Churches at the same time, 306.—IV. The principal use of them in the Primitive Church, to be a sort of nursery for the hierarchy, 306.—V. None of these allowed to forsake their service, and return to a mere secular life again, 307.—VI. How they differed from the superior orders in name, in office, and manner of ordination, 308.

CHAPTER II.

Of subdeacons.

SECT. I. No mention of subdeacons till the third century, 309.—II. Their ordination performed without imposition of hands in the Latin Church,

310.—III. A brief account of their offices, 311.—IV. What offices they might not perform, 312.—V. The singularity of the Church of Rome in keeping to the precise number of seven subdeacons, 313.

CHAPTER III.

Of acolythists.

SECT. I. Acolythists, an order peculiar to the Latin Church, and never mentioned by any Greek writer for four centuries, 313.—II. Their ordination and office, 314.—III. The origination of the name, 314.—IV. Whether acolythists be the same with the *deputati* and *ceroferarii* of of latter ages, 315.

CHAPTER IV.

Of exorcists.

SECT. I. Exorcists, at first no peculiar order of the clergy, 316.—II. Bishops and presbyters, for the three first centuries, the usual exorcists of the Church, 317.—III. In what sense every man his own exorcist, 318. —IV. Exorcists constituted into an order in the latter end of the third century, 319.—V. Their ordination and office, 321.—VI. A short account of the energumens, their names, and station in the church, 321. —VII. The exorcists chiefly concerned in the care of them, 322.—VIII. The duty of exorcists in reference to the catechumens, 323.

CHAPTER V.

Of lectors or readers.

SECT. I. The order of readers not instituted till the third century, 324.—II. By whom the Scriptures were read in the church before the institution of that order, 325.—III. The manner of ordaining readers, 327.—IV. Their station and office in the church, 328.—V. The age at which they might be ordained, 329.

CHAPTER VI.

Of the ostiarii or door-keepers.

SECT. I. No mention of this order till the third or fourth century, 330.—II. The manner of their ordination in the Latin Church, 330.—III. Their office and function, 331.

CHAPTER VII.

Of the psalmistæ or singers.

SECT. I. The singers a distinct order from readers in the Primitive Church, 332.—II. Their institution and office, 333.—III. Why called ὑποβολεῖς, 334.—IV. What sort of ordinance they had, 335.

CHAPTER VIII.

Of the copiatæ or fossarii.

SECT. I. The *copiatæ* or *fossarii* reckoned among the *clerici* of the Primitive Church, 335.—II. First instituted in the time of Constantine, 337. —III. Why called *decani* and *collegiati*, 338.—IV. Their office and privileges, 338.

CHAPTER IX.

Of the parabolani.

SECT. I. The *parabolani* ranked by some among the *clerici*, 339.—II. Their institution and office, 339.—III. The reason of the name *parabolani*, 341.—IV. Some laws and rules relating to their behaviour, 342.

CHAPTER X.

Of the catechists.

SECT. I. Catechists no distinct order of the clergy, but chosen out of any other order, 343.—II. Readers sometimes made catechists, 344.—III. Why called ναυτολόγοι by some Greek writers, 345.—IV. Whether all catechists taught publicly in the church, 346.—V. Of the succession in the Catechetic School at Alexandria, 347.

CHAPTER XI.

Of the defensores or syndics of the Church.

SECT. I. Five sorts of *defensores* noted, whereof two only belonged to the Church, 348.—II. Of the *defensores pauperum*, 349.—III. of the *defensores ecclesiæ*, their office and function, 349.—IV. Of their quality. Whether they were clergymen or laymen, 351.—V. The ἔκδικοι and ἐκκλησιέκδικοι among the Greeks the same with the *defensores* of the Latin Church, 353.—VI. Chancellors and defensors not the same in the Primitive Church, 354.—VII. Whether the defensor's office was the same with that of our modern chancellors, 355.

CHAPTER XII.

Of the œconomi, or stewards and guardians of the Church.

SECT. I. The *œconomi* instituted in the fourth century. The reasons of their institution, 356.—II. These always to be chosen out of the clergy, 358.—III. Their office to take care of the revenues of the Church, especially in the vacancy of the bishopric, 359.—IV. The consent of the clergy required in the choice of them, 359.

CHAPTER XIII.

A brief account of some other inferior officers in the Church.

SECT. I. Of the παραμονάριοι or *mansionarii*, 360.—II. Of the *custodes ecclesiarum*, and *custodes locorum sanctorum;* and how these differed from each other, 361.—III. Of the *sceuophylaces* or *ceimeliarchæ*, 362.—IV. Of the *hermeneutæ* or *interpreters*, 363.—V. Of the *notarii*, 363.—VI. Of the *apocrisiarii* or *responsales*, 365.

THE ANTIQUITIES

OF THE

CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

BOOK I.

OF THE SEVERAL NAMES AND ORDERS OF MEN IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

CHAP. I.

Of the several titles and appellations of Christians, which they owned and distinguished themselves by.

Christians at first called *Jesseans*, and *Therapeutæ*, Πιστοὶ, Ἐκλεκτοὶ, &c.

1. WHEN Christianity was first planted in the world, they who embraced it were commonly known among themselves by the names of *disciples, believers, elect, saints, and brethren,* before they assumed the title and appellation of Christians. Epiphanius[1] says they were also called Ἰεσσαῖοι, *Jesseans,* either from Jesse, the father of David, or, which is more probable, from the name of the Lord Jesus. He adds, that Philo speaks of them under this appellation in his book Περὶ Ἰεσσαίων, which he affirms to be no other but Christians who went by that name in Egypt, whilst St. Mark preached the Gospel at Alexandria. This book of Philo's is now extant under another

[1] Hær. 29. Nazar. n. 4. (t. 1. p. 120 a.) Ἀλλ' ὅμως ἐπειδὴ εἰς τὸν τόπον ἐλήλυθα, εἰπεῖν δι' ἣν αἰτίαν Ἰεσσαῖοι ἐκαλοῦντο, πρὶν τοῦ καλεῖσθαι Χριστιανοὶ οἱ εἰς Χριστὸν πεπιστευκότες, τούτου ἕνεκα ἔφημεν, ὅτι ὁ Ἰεσσαὶ πατὴρ γίνεται τοῦ Δαβίδ. Καὶ ἤτοι τοῦ Ἰεσσαὶ, ἤτοι ἐκ τοῦ ὀνόματος Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν ἐπεκλήθησαν Ἰεσσαῖοι, διὰ τὸ ἐξ Ἰησοῦ ὁρμᾶσθαι μαθηταὶ ὄντες αὐτοῦ, ἢ διὰ τὸ τῆς ἐτυμολογίας τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Κυρίου.

title, Περὶ Βίου Θεωρητικοῦ, *Of the Contemplative Life*, and so it is cited by Eusebius[2]; who is also of opinion, that it is nothing but a description of the Christians in Egypt, whom he calls *therapeutæ*, which signifies either *worshippers of the true God*, or *spiritual physicians*, who undertook to cure men's minds of all vicious and corrupt affections. But whether this name was invented by Philo, as most proper to express their way of living, or was then the common name of believers in Egypt, before the name of Christian was spread over all the world, Eusebius does not undertake to determine. However, he concludes it was a name given to the Christians; and St. Jerom[3] is so positive in it, that for this reason he gives Philo a place in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, telling us that he wrote a book concerning the first church of St. Mark at Alexandria.

Some learned critics[4] of the last age call this whole matter into question; but their arguments are answered by others[5] as learned; and therefore I shall enter no further into this dispute, but refer the reader that is curious thither for satisfaction. That which I here take notice of further is only this, that these names *Therapeutæ* and *Jessæi* were scarce ever used in after-ages: but the other names, ἅγιοι, πιστοὶ, ἐκλεκτοὶ, *saints, believers, elect*, &c., occur frequently in ecclesiastical writers,

[2] L. 2. c. 17. (v. 1. p. 66. 8.) Πρῶτον γέτοι τὸ μηθὲν πέρα τῆς ἀληθείας οἰκοθέν τε καὶ ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ προσθήσειν, ἐν οἷς ἱστορήσειν ἔμελλεν ἀπισχυρισάμενος [ὁ Φίλων], ἐν ᾧ ἐπέγραψε λόγῳ περὶ βίου θεωρητικοῦ ἢ ἱκετῶν, θεραπευτὰς αὐτοὺς καὶ τὰς σὺν αὐτοῖς γυναῖκας θεραπευτρίδας ἀποκαλεῖσθαί φησι, τὰς αἰτίας ἐπειπὼν τῆς τοιᾶσδε προσρήσεως· ἤτοι παρὰ τὸ τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν προσιόντων αὐτοῖς, τῶν ἀπὸ κακίας παθῶν, ἰατρῶν δίκην ἀπαλλάττοντας ἀκεῖσθαι καὶ θεραπεύειν· ἢ τῆς περὶ τὸ θεῖον καθαρᾶς καὶ εἰλικρινοῦς θεραπείας τε καὶ θρησκείας ἕνεκα. Εἶτ' οὖν ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ ταύτην αὐτοῖς ἐπιτέθειται τὴν προσηγορίαν, οἰκείως ἐπιγράψας τῷ τρόπῳ τῶν ἀνδρῶν τοὔνομα, εἴτε καὶ ὄντως τοῦτ' αὐτοὺς ἐκάλουν καταρχὰς οἱ πρῶτοι, μηδαμῶς τῆς Χριστιανῶν πω προσρήσεως ἀνὰ πάντα τόπον ἐπιπεφημισμένης, οὔτι πω διατείνεσθαι ἀναγκαῖον.

[3] De Script. Eccles. c. 11. (t. 2. p. 833.) Philo Judæus, natione Alexandrinus, de genere sacerdotum, idcirco a nobis inter Scriptores Ecclesiasticos ponitur, quia librum de prima Marci Evangelistæ apud Alexandriam scribens ecclesia, in nostrorum laude versatus est.

[4] Vales. in Euseb. l. c. (Ibid. n. 3.) Hos [θεραπευτὰς] Eusebius noster vult fuisse Christianos, qui ex Hebræis conversi ab Evangelista Marco strictiorem quandam vivendi disciplinam fuerant amplexi. At Scaliger noster in lib. 6. de Emendatione Temporum, Essenos illos fuisse contendit, et Eusebium graviter reprehendit, qui Christianos illos fuisse affirmaverit.

[5] Bevereg. Cod. Can. Vindic. l. 3. c. 5. n. 4. (ap. Cotel. t. 2. append. pp. 145 seqq.)

and signify, not any select number of Christians (as now the words *saints* and *elect* are often used to signify only the predestinate), but all Christians in general who were entered into the communion of the church by the waters of baptism. For so Theodoret[6] and others explain the word ἅγιοι, *saints*, to be such as were vouchsafed the honour and privilege of baptism.

Of the technical name ΙΧΘΥΣ and *Pisciculi*.

2. And upon this account, because the Christian life took its original from the waters of baptism, and depended upon the observance of the covenant made therein, the Christians were wont to please themselves with the artificial name *pisciculi*, 'fishes,' to denote, as Tertullian[7] words it, 'that they were regenerate, or born again into Christ's religion by water, and could not be saved but by continuing therein.' And this name was the rather chosen by them, because the initial letters of our Saviour's names and titles in Greek, Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, Θεοῦ Υἱὸς, Σωτὴρ, *Jesus Christ, the Son of God, our Saviour*, technically put together, made up the name ΙΧΘΥΣ, which signifies *a fish*, and is alluded to both by Tertullian and Optatus[8].

Christians why call *Gnostici*.

3. Sometimes Christians also style themselves by the name of *Gnostics*, Γνωστικοὶ, *men of understanding and knowledge;* because the Christian religion was the truest wisdom, and the knowledge of the most divine and heavenly things. This name was aped and abused by a perverse sort of heretics, who are commonly known and distinguished by the name of *Gnostics*, because of their great pretences to knowledge and science falsely so called. Yet this did not hinder but that the Christians sometimes laid claim to it, as having indeed the only just and proper right to make use of it. For which reason Clemens Alexandrinus[9], in all his writings, gives the

[6] In Phil. 1, 1. (t. 3. part. 1. p. 445.) Ἁγίους γὰρ τοὺς τοῦ βαπτίσματος ἀξιωθέντας ὠνόμασεν.

[7] De Bapt. c. 1. (p. 224 b.) Nos pisciculi secundum ΙΧΘΥΝ nostrum Jesum Christum in aqua nascimur; nec aliter quam in aqua permanendo salvi sumus.

[8] Cont. Parmen. l. 3. p. 62. (p. 61.) Hic est *Piscis*, qui in baptismate per invocationem fontalibus undis inseritur, ut quæ aqua fuerat, a pisce etiam piscina vocitetur. Cujus Piscis nomen, secundum appellationem Græcam in uno nomine per singulas literas turbam sanctorum nominum continet, ΙΧΘΥΣ, quod est Latine, Jesus Christus, Dei Filius, Salvator.

[9] Strom. i. p. 294. (p. 345. 10.) Ἀρκεῖ δὲ τῷ γνωστικῷ κἂν εἷς μόνος ἀκροατὴς εὑρεθῇ.—Strom. 2. p. 383. (p. 457. 8.)...Εἰ ὁ Κύριος ἀλήθεια καὶ σοφία καὶ δύναμις Θεοῦ, ὥσπερ οὖν ἐστι, δειχθείη ὅτι τῷ ὄντι γνωστικὸς

Christian philosopher the appellation of *γνωστικός*. Athanasius[10] calls the ascetics of Egypt, who were of the contemplative life, by the same name *γνωστικοί*; and Socrates tells us, Evagrius Ponticus wrote a book for the use of these ascetics, which he entitled, *The Gnostic*, i. e. 'Rules for the Contemplative Life;' some fragments of which are yet extant in Socrates[11], and some others published by Cotelerius in his Monuments of the Greek Church. In one of these fragments there is mention made of a monk, who is styled, *μοναχὸς τῆς Παρεμβολῆς, τῶν γνωστικῶν ὁ δοκιμώτατος*, which the first translators of Socrates not understanding render, *A monk of great renown of the sect of the Gnostics*, as if he had been one of the Gnostic heretics; whereas it means no more than *a monk of the contemplative life*, who inhabited in a village called the *Parembole*, not far from Alexandria; being one of those ascetics whom Evagrius and all the rest call by the then known name of Christian Gnostics. See Valesius's note upon Socrates[12].

etimes d *Theo-* i and *sto-* i.

4. Another name which frequently occurs in the writings of the ancients is that of *Θεοφόροι*, which signifies *temples of God*, and is as old as Ignatius, who usually gave himself this title; as appears both from the inscriptions of his Epistles, each of which begins *Ἰγνάτιος ὁ καὶ Θεοφόρος*; as also from the ancient Acts of his martyrdom[13], where the reason of the name is explained in his dialogue with Trajan, who hearing him style himself *Theophorus* asked what that name meant. To which

ὁ τοῦτον ἐγνωκὼς καὶ τὸν πατέρα τὸν αὐτοῦ δι' αὐτοῦ.—Strom. 6. p. 665. (p. 791. 8.) *Εὔχεται τοίνυν ὁ γνωστικὸς καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἔννοιαν πᾶσαν τὴν ὥραν δι' ἀγάπης οἰκειούμενος τῷ Θεῷ.* —Strom. 7. p. 748. (p. 881. 36.).... *Δι' αὐτὸ τὸ εἶναι γνωστικὸν αὐτὸς ἐργάζεται τὴν εὐποιΐαν, κ. τ. λ.*

[10] Ap. Socrat. l. 4. c. 23. (v. 2. p. 241. 31.) *Τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ὁ ἅγιος φωστὴρ Ἀθανάσιος, τὴν τράπεζαν, φησὶ, Μωϋσῆς εἰς τὸ βόρειον μέρος στῆσαι προστάσσεται. Γινωσκέτωσαν οἱ γνωστικοὶ τίς ὁ πνέων ἐστὶ κατ' αὐτῶν, καὶ πάντα πειρασμὸν γενναίως ὑπομενέτωσαν.*

[11] Ibid. (p. 139. 17.) *Τούτῳ [Εὐαγρίῳ] καὶ βιβλία ἄγαν σπουδαῖα συγγέγραπται· ὧν τὸ μὲν, Μοναχὸς ἢ Περὶ Πρακτικῆς ἐπιγέγραπται· τὸ δὲ, Γνωστικὸς ἢ Πρὸς τὸν καταξιωθέντα γνώσεως.*

[12] [L. c. (Ibid. n. 2.) Turpiter hoc loco hallucinati sunt interpretes, &c. Ed.]

[13] Act. Ignat. ap. Grab. Spicileg. (t. 2. p. 10.) *Ἰγνάτιος εἶπεν· Οὐδεὶς Θεοφόρον ἀποκαλεῖ κακοδαίμονα· ἀφεστήκασι γὰρ ἀπὸ τῶν δούλων τοῦ Θεοῦ τὰ δαιμόνια.....Τραϊανὸς εἶπεν· Καὶ τίς ἐστιν Θεοφόρος; Ἰγνάτιος ἀπεκρίνατο· Ὁ Χριστὸν ἔχων ἐν στέρνοις.....Τραϊανὸς εἶπεν· Σὺ οὖν ἐν σεαυτῷ φέρεις τὸν σταυρωθέντα; Ἰγνάτιος εἶπεν· Ναί· γέγραπται γάρ· Ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐμπερπατήσω.*

Ignatius replied, that it meant 'one that carried Christ in his heart.' 'Dost thou then,' said Trajan, 'carry him that was crucified in thy heart?' Ignatius answered, 'Yes; for it is written, "I will dwell in them and walk in them."' Anastasius Bibliothecarius[14] indeed gives another reason why Ignatius was called *Theophorus*, because he was the child whom our Saviour took[15] and set in the midst of his disciples, laying his hands upon him; and therefore the Apostles would never presume to ordain him again by imposition of hands after Christ. But, as bishop Pearson[16] and others have observed, this was a mere invention of the modern Greeks, from whom Anastasius took it without further inquiry. Much more ridiculous and absurd is the reason which is assigned by Vincentius Bellovacensis[17] and some others, that Ignatius was so called because the name of Jesus Christ was found written in golden letters in his heart. Both these fancies are sufficiently refelled by the genuine Acts of his martyrdom, which give a more rational account of the name, and such as plainly intimates that it was no peculiar title of Ignatius, but common to

[14] [Hist. Synod. 8. s. C. Constant. 4. ap. Hist. Eccles. et De Vit. Pontif. Paris. 1649. (ap. CC. t. 8. p. 994 d.) *Ignatius Deifer.* Tradunt Græci quod parvulus, quem Dominus advocatum statuit in medio dicens, *Nisi conversi fueritis, et efficiamini sicut hic parvulus*, &c., iste Ignatius fuit, et idcirco hunc Deiferum nuncupant. Unde nec Apostoli ausi fuerint ei, cum ad ecclesiæ præsulatum admoveretur, amplius manus imponere, nimirum quem ore Dei laudatum, et ipsius tactu sanctificatum cognoverint. Ed.]

[15] Matt. 18, 2. Mark 9, 36. Luke 9, 47.

[16] Vindic. Ignat. part. 2. c. 12. (ap. Cotel. v. 2. append. pp. 397 seqq.)—Grab. Spicileg. (t. 2. p. 2.) Notissimum est, &c.—Cave, Life of Ignatius, sect. 1. (v. 1. p. 176.) .... We are told that he was that very child whom our Saviour took into his arms, and set in the midst of the disciples as the most lively instance of innocency and humility. And this is affirmed, if number might carry it, not only by the Greeks in their public rituals, (Menæon. Græcor. Τῇ εἰκοστῇ τοῦ Δεκέμβ.,) by Metaphrastes, Nicephorus, and others; but, as the primate of Armagh (Annot. in Ignat. Act. p. 37.) observes from the MSS. in his own possession, by two Syriac writers more ancient than they. But how confidently or generally soever it be reported, the story at best is precarious and uncertain, not to say absolutely false and groundless. Sure I am St. Chrysostom, (Hom. in S. Ignat. sect. 4.) who had far better opportunities of knowing than they, expressly affirms of Ignatius, that he never saw our Saviour, or enjoyed any familiarity or converse with him.

[17] Specul. Hist. l. 10. c. 57. (juxt. Ed. Venet. 1494. fol. ad summ. col. dextr.) Hujus cor cum minutatim divisum esset, nomen Domini Jesu Christi literis aureis inscriptum, ut legitur, in singulis partibus inventum est. Dixerat enim se habere Christum in corde.

him with all other Christians: as indeed bishop Pearson does abundantly prove from several passages of Clemens Alexandrinus, Gregory Nazianzen, Palladius, Eulogius, Theodoret, Cyril of Alexandria, Photius, Maximus, and others. Particularly Clemens[18] assigns the same reason of the name as Ignatius does, 'that the Christian is therefore called *θεοφορῶν* and *θεοφορούμενος* because, as the Apostle says, he is the temple of God.' We sometimes also meet with the name *Christophori* in the same sense, as in the Epistle of Phileas, bishop of Thmuis, recorded by Eusebius; where, speaking of the martyrs of his own time, he gives them the title of *χριστοφόροι μάρτυρες*[19], because they were temples of Christ, and acted by his Holy Spirit.

ometimes, it very rely, *hristi.*

5. St. Ambrose in one place gives them the name of *Christi* in a qualified sense; alluding to the signification of the word *christus* in Scripture; where it sometimes signifies any one that is *anointed* with oil, or receives any commission from God by a spiritual unction; in which sense every Christian is the Lord's anointed: and therefore he says[20], 'It is no injury for the servant to bear the character of the lord, nor for the soldier to be called by the name of his general; forasmuch as God himself hath said, "Touch not mine anointed,"' or, *my christs, christos meos,* as now the vulgar translation reads it (Ps. cv. 15); and St. Jerom also, who in his Notes upon the place[21] observes, 'that all men are called *christs* who are anointed with the Holy Ghost, as the ancient Patriarchs before the Law, who had no other unction.' Yet we do not find that the Christians generally took this name upon them, but rather reserved it to their Lord as his peculiar name and title.

istians ta' one- es to all

6. Yet it is very observable, that in all the names they chose there was still some peculiar relation to Christ and God,

[18] Strom. 7. p. 748. (p. 882. 7.) Θεῖος ἄρα ὁ γνωστικὸς καὶ ἤδη ἅγιος, Θεοφορῶν καὶ Θεοφορούμενος.

[19] L. 8. c. 10. (v. 1. p. 388. 23.) Διὰ καὶ ζηλώσαντες τὰ μείζονα χαρίσματα οἱ χριστοφόροι μάρτυρες, πάντα μὲν ἀνῶν καὶ παντοίας αἰκισμῶν ἐπιμονῇ νικῶν εἰσέπαυξ, ἀλλ' ἤδη καὶ δεύτερον τοῦτον ὑπεμείναν, πάσας δὲ ἀπειλὰς [illegible].

[20] Ep. Obit. Valentin. t. 3. p. 12. (t. 2. p. 1189 d. n. 58.) Nec injuriam putes: charactere Domini inscribuntur et servuli, et nomine imperatoris signantur milites. Denique et ipse Dominus dixit, Nolite tangere Christos meos.

[21] In Ps. 104. (t. 7. p. 279.) Ecce ante legem Patriarchæ non uncti regali unguento Christi dicuntur. Christi autem sunt, qui Spiritu Sancto unguntur.

from whom they would be named, and not from any mortal man, how great or eminent soever. Party names and human appellations they ever professed to abhor. 'We take not our denomination from men,' says Chrysostom[22], 'we have no leaders, as the followers of Marcion, or Manichæus, or Arius.' 'No,' says Epiphanius[23], 'the church was never called so much as by the name of any Apostle. We never heard of Petrians, or Paulians, or Bartholomæans, or Thaddæans, but only of Christians, from Christ.' 'I honour Peter,' says another Father[24], 'but I am not called a Petrian; I honour Paul, but I am not called a Paulian; I cannot bear to be named from any man who am the creature of God.' They observe that this was only the property of sects and heresies, to take party names and denominate themselves from their leaders. The great and venerable name of *Christians* was neglected by them, whilst they profanely divided themselves into human appellations,' as Gregory Nyssen[25] and Nazianzen[26] complain. Thus Basil[27] observes, how the Marcionites and Valentinians rejected the name of *Christians* to be called after the names

party name and human appellations.

[22] Hom. 33. in Act. Apost. (t. 9. p. 260 b.) .... Μὴ γὰρ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων καλούμεθα; μὴ γὰρ προηγούμενος ἡμῶν τίς ἐστιν, ὥσπερ τῷ μὲν Μαρκίων, τῷ δὲ Μανιχαῖος, τῷ δὲ Ἄρειος, τῷ δὲ ἄλλος τις αἱρέσεως ἀρχηγός;

[23] Hær. 42. Marcion. (t. 1. p. 366 d.) Οὐ κηρύσσουσιν ἑαυτοὺς οἱ Ἀπόστολοι, ἀλλὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν Κύριον. διὸ οὐκ ἔνι αἵρεσις, οὐδὲ ἐκκλησία εἰς ὄνομα Ἀποστόλων ἀνηγορευμένη· οὐδέποτε γὰρ ἠκούσαμεν ἢ Πετρίους, ἢ Παυλίους, ἢ Βαρθολομαίους, ἢ Θαδδαίους· ἀλλὰ ἀπαρχῆς ἓν κήρυγμα πάντων τῶν Ἀποστόλων, οὐκ αὐτοὺς κηρύσσον, ἀλλὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν Κύριον. Διὸ καὶ ὄνομα τῆς ἐκκλησίας οἱ πάντες ἔθεντο ἓν, οὐχ ἑαυτῶν, ἀλλὰ τοῦ Κυρίου αὐτῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἀπὸ Ἀντιοχείας ἀρξαμένων Χριστιανῶν καλεῖσθαι.

[24] Greg. Naz. Orat. 31. (t. 1. p. 506 c.) Πέτρον τιμῶ, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀκούω Πετριανός· καὶ Παῦλον, Παυλιανὸς δὲ οὐκ ἤκουσα. οὐ δέχομαι παρὰ ἀνθρώπων ὀνομάζεσθαι, παρὰ Θεοῦ γεγονώς.—Vid. Athan. Orat. 2. [al. Orat. 1.] n. 2. cont. Arium. (t. 1. part. 1. p. 320 b. c. d.) Ἀντὶ γὰρ Χριστοῦ, παρ' αὐτοῖς Ἀρεῖος, ὡς παρὰ Μανιχαίοις Μανιχαῖος, κ. τ. λ. ... Μὴ γὰρ προφασιζέσθωσαν, κ. τ. λ. ... Οὐδὲ πώποτε γὰρ λαὸς ἀπὸ τῶν οἰκείων ἐπισκόπων ἔσχε τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου, κ. τ. λ. It. Greg. Nyss. de Perfect. Christ. (t. 3. p. 276 a.) .... Μίαν εἶναι κυρίαν κλῆσιν τοῖς εἰς αὐτὸν πεπιστευκόσι δεδώρηται, τὸ Χριστιανοὺς ὀνομάζεσθαι.

[25] Cont. Apollin. (t. 3. p. 261 c.) Σιγᾶται τὸ μέγα καὶ σεβάσμιον ὄνομα τῶν Χριστιανῶν, πρὸς δὲ τὰς ἀνθρωπίνας προσηγορίας ἡ ἐκκλησία καταμερίζεται.

[26] Orat. 32. In Præsent. Episc. (t. 1. p. 524 b.) Αἰσχύνομαι τὸ γῆρας, ἄλλων καλούμενος, ὑπὸ Χριστοῦ σεσωσμένος.

[27] In Ps. 48. p. 245. (t. 1. part. 1. p. 262 d.) Κἂν ἴδῃς δέ τινα τῶν ἐπὶ ψευδωνύμῳ γνώσει μεγαλοφρονούντων, καὶ προσνεμόντων ἑαυτοὺς πονηρῶν τινων δογμάτων συγκαταθέσεσι, καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος Χριστιανῶν, ἀφ' ἑνός τινος τῶν αἱρεσιαρχησάντων ἑαυτοὺς ὀνομάζοντας, Μαρκίωνος, κ. τ. λ.

of Marcion and Valentinus their leaders. Optatus[28] and St. Austin[29] bring the same charge against the Donatists. Optatus says, it was the usual question of Donatus to all foreigners, *Quid apud vos agitur de parte mea?* 'How go the affairs of my party among you?' And the bishops who were his followers were used to subscribe themselves, *Ex parte Donati.* Epiphanius[30] observes the same of the Audians, Colluthians, and Arians; and he tells us more particularly of Meletius and his followers[31], that, having formed a schism, they left the old name of 'the Catholic Church,' and styled themselves by a distinguishing character, 'the Church of the Martyrs,' with an invidious design to cast a reproach upon all others that were not of their party. In like manner, as the Arians styled themselves *Lucianists*[32] and *Conlucianists*, pretending to follow the doctrine of Lucian the martyr.

But the Church of Christ still kept to the name of Christian. This was the name they gloried in as most expressive of their unity and relation to Christ. Eusebius[33] records a memorable story, out of the Epistle of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne, in France, concerning one Sanctus, a deacon of

[28] L. 3. p. 66. (p. 68.) .... Ad singulos quosque venientes hæc erant verba, *Quid apud vos agitur de parte mea?* Quasi jam vere populum cum Deo diviserat, ut intrepide suam diceret partem. Nam a temporibus ejus, et usque in hodiernum, si quando de rebus ecclesiasticis in judiciis publicis aliqua celebrata est actio, interrogati singuli, sic apud acta locuti sunt, ut dicerent se de parte esse Donati; de Christo tacuerunt.

[29] Ep. 68. [al. 88.] ad Januar. (t. 2. p. 213 d.) .... Quod pars Donati, quæ primo apud Carthaginem pars Majorini dicebatur.

[30] Hær. 70. Audian. n. 15. (t. 1. p. 827 c.) Καὶ τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ φοβερὸν, τὸ παραλλάξαι ὄνομα Χριστιανῶν τῆς ἁγίας ἐκκλησίας, τῆς μὴ ἐχούσης ἐπίθετον ὄνομα, ἀλλὰ μόνον ὄνομα Χριστοῦ καὶ Χριστιανῶν, εἰς ὄνομα Αὐδίου καλεῖσθαι, συνθέσθαι τε καὶ ἀπαιτεῖσθαι σύνθημα ἀνθρωπίνης φύσεως, κ. τ. λ.—It. Hær. 69. Arian. n. 2. (Ibid. p. 728 d.) Ὡς οὖν ἐξηγεῖτο ἕκαστος ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἄλλος ἄλλο τι, καὶ ἄλλος ἄλλο, ἐκ τῆς προσκλήσεως καὶ ἐπαίνου δὲ τοῦ παρ' αὐτῶν, οἱ καὶ Κολλουθιανοὺς ἑαυτοὺς ὠνόμασαν, ἄλλοι δὲ Ἀρειανούς.

[31] Hær. 68. Melet. n. 3. (Ibid. p. 719 b.) Ἐπέγραφον δὲ ἕκαστος ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ, οἱ μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ Πέτρου διαδεξάμενοι, ἔχοντες τὰς οὔσας ἀρχαίας ἐκκλησίας, ὅτι Ἐκκλησία Καθολική. Οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ Μελητίου, Ἐκκλησία Μαρτύρων.

[32] Theodoret. l. 1. c. 5. ex Ep. Arii ad Euseb. (v. 3. p. 23. 8.) Ἐρρῶσθαί σε ἐν Κυρίῳ εὔχομαι, μεμνημένου τῶν θλίψεων ἡμῶν, Συλλουκιανιστὰ ἀληθῶς Εὐσέβιε.—Cf. Epiph. Hær. 69. Arian. n. 7. ubi eadem verba leguntur.

[33] L. 5. c. 1. (v. 1. p. 202. 16.) .... Πρὸς πάντα τὰ ἐπερωτώμενα ἀπεκρίνατο τῇ Ῥωμαϊκῇ φωνῇ, Χριστιανός εἰμι. Τοῦτο καὶ ἀντὶ ὀνόματος, καὶ ἀντὶ πόλεως, καὶ ἀντὶ γένους, καὶ ἀντὶ παντὸς ἐπαλλήλως ὡμολόγει· ἄλλην δὲ φωνὴν οὐκ ἤκουσαν αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔθνη.

the Church of Vienne, who suffered in the persecution under Antonine; 'that, being put to the rack, and examined by the magistrates concerning his name, his country, his city, his quality, whether he were bond or free, his answer to all their questions was, "I am a Christian." This, he said, was to him both name, and city, and kindred, and everything; nor could the heathen, with all their skill, extort any other answer from him.' St. Chrysostom[34] gives the like account of the behaviour of Lucian the martyr before his persecutors; and there are some other instances of the same nature, by which we may judge how great a veneration they had for the name Christian.

Of the name *Catholic*, and its antiquity.

7. The importunity of heretics made them add another name to this; viz. that of *Catholic;* which was, as it were, their surname or characteristic, to distinguish them from all sects, who, though they had party names, yet sometimes sheltered themselves under the common name of Christians. This we learn from Pacian's Epistle to Sempronian, the Novatian heretic, whom, demanding of him the reason why Christians called themselves Catholics, he answers, that it was to discern them from Heretics, who went by the name of Christians. 'Christian is my name,' says he[35], 'and Catholic my surname: the one is my title, the other my character or mark of distinction.' Heretics commonly confined religion, either to a particular region, or some select party of men, and therefore had no pretence to style themselves Catholics: but the Church of Christ had a just title to this name, being called Catholic, as Optatus[36] observes, because it was universally diffused over all the world; and in this sense the name is as ancient almost as the Church itself. For we meet with it in the passion of Polycarp in Eusebius[37], in Clemens Alexandrinus[38], and Ignatius[39]; and so

[34] Hom. 46. in Lucian. t. 1. p. 602. (t. 2. p. 528 a.) Ὁ δὲ πρὸς ἑκάστην πεῦσιν ἀπεκρίνατο, ὅτι Χριστιανός εἰμι, μόνον, καὶ, λέγοντος τοῦ δημίου, Ποίας εἶ πατρίδος; Χριστιανός εἰμί φησι· Τί ἔχεις ἐπιτήδευμα; Χριστιανός εἰμι· Τίνας προγόνους; Ὁ δὲ πρὸς πάντα [al. ἅπαντα] ἔλεγεν, ὅτι Χριστιανός εἰμι.

[35] Ep. 1. ad Sempron. (Galland. t. 7. p. 258 b.) Christianus mihi nomen est, Catholicus vero cognomen; illud me nuncupat, istud ostendit.

[36] L. 2. p. 46. (p. 44.) ... Et hanc sanctam esse catholicam, quæ in toto sit orbe terrarum diffusa.

[37] L. 4. c. 15. (v. 1. p. 162. 23.) ... Ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ παροικοῦσα Σμύρναν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ παροικούσῃ ἐν Φιλομηλίῳ καὶ πάσαις ταῖς κατὰ πάντα τόπον τῆς ἁγίας καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας παροικίαις, ἔλεος, εἰρήνη, κ. τ. λ. [Conf. Patres Apost. Jacobson, Oxon. 1838. v. 2. pp. 543, 544. Ed.]

[38] Strom. l. 7. (p. 899. 12.) Κατά

great a regard had they for this name, that they would own none to be Christians who did not profess themselves to be of the Catholic Chunch; as we may see in the Acts of Pionius the martyr[40], who being asked by Polemo, the judge, 'of what Church he was,' answered 'I am of the Catholic Church; for Christ has no other.'

In what sense the name *Ecclesiastics* was given to all Christians.

8. I must here observe further, that the name of *Ecclesiastics* was sometimes attributed to all Christians in general. For though this was a peculiar name of the clergy, as contradistinct from the laity, in the Christian Church, yet, when Christians in general are spoken of in opposition to Jews, infidels, and heretics, then they have all the name of *Ecclesiastics*, or *men of the Church*, as being neither of the Jewish synagogues, nor of the heathen temples, nor heretical conventicles, but members of the Church of Christ. In this sense *ἄνδρες ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ* is often used by Eusebius[41] and Cyril[42] of Jerusalem; and Valesius[43] observes the same in Origen, Epiphanius, St. Jerom, and others.

The Christian religion called *Δόγμα*, and Christians, *Οἱ τοῦ Δόγματος*.

9. Sometimes also we find the word *Δόγμα* put absolutely to signify the Christian religion, as Chrysostom[44] and Theodoret[45] say St. Paul himself uses the word in his Epistle to the Ephesians, ii. 15. Estius[46] assures us, it was the common interpreta-

τε οὖν ὑπόστασιν, κατά τε ἐπίνοιαν, κατά τε ἀρχὴν, κατά τε ἐξοχὴν, μόνην εἶναι φαμὲν τὴν ἀρχαίαν καὶ καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, κ.τ.λ.

39 Ep. ad Smyrn. n. 8. (v. 2. p. 37.) *Ὅπου ἂν φανῇ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, ἐκεῖ τὸ πλῆθος ἔστω, ὥσπερ ὅπου ἂν ᾖ Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, ἐκεῖ ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία.*

40 Ap. Baron. An. 254. n. 9. (t. 2. p. 448 e.) Cujus, inquit Polemo, es Ecclesiæ? Respondit Pionius, Catholicæ: nulla enim est alia apud Christum.

41 L. 4. c. 7. (v. 1. p. 148. 3.) *Πλείστων οὖν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἀνδρῶν κατ' ἐκεῖνο καιροῦ τῆς ἀληθείας ὑπεραγωνιζομένων, κ.τ.λ.*—L. 5. c. 27. (p. 251. 4.) *Πλεῖστα μὲν οὖν παρὰ πολλοῖς εἰσέτι νῦν τῶν τότε σώζεται παλαιῶν καὶ ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἀνδρῶν, κ.τ.λ.*

42 Catech. 15. n. 4. [al. 7.] (p. 226 d.) *Ἀλλὰ ζητοῦμεν τῆς παρουσίας ἡμέτερον σημεῖον· ἐκκλησιαστικὸν ζητοῦμεν οἱ ἐκκλησιαστικοί.*

43 Not. in Euseb. l. 2. c. 25. (v. 1. p. 83. n. 4.) Tribus modis dicitur ecclesiasticus. Interdum enim accipitur pro Christiano et opponitur Gentili. ... Interdum vero designat catholicum et opponitur hæretico. ... Denique interdum denotat eum, qui in clero est constitutus, et opponitur sæculari seu laico.

44 In Ephes. 2, 15. Hom. 5. (t. 2. p. 35 c.) *Ἡ τὴν πίστιν οὖν φησι, δόγμα αὐτὴν καλῶν, κ.τ.λ.*

45 In Ephes. ibid. (t. 3. part. 1. p. 414.) *Δόγματα δὲ τὴν εὐαγγελικὴν διδασκαλίαν ἐκάλεσεν.*

46 In Ephes. l. c. (p. 609.) Edicta, seu decreta, seu dogmata hoc loco tam Græci quam Latini commentatores magno consensu interpretantur præcepta Novi Testamenti, quæ sunt de fide, caritate, et moribus, quæ nimirum Christus in Evangelio tradidit.

tion of all ancient expositors, both Greek and Latin, upon that place. Hence it was that Christians were called sometimes, Οἱ τοῦ δόγματος, *men of the faith*, meaning the faith of Christ. As in the Rescript of Aurelian, the Emperor, against Paulus Samosatensis, recorded by Eusebius[47], the bishops of Italy and Rome are styled, Ἐπίσκοποι τοῦ δόγματος, *bishops of the faith*, that is, the Christian faith.

Christian called *Je* by the H thens.

10. The heathens also were used to confound the names of Jews and Christians together; whence, in heathen authors, the name of *Jews* by mistake is often given to the Christians. Thus Dio, in the life of Domitian[48], speaking of Acilius Glabrio, a man of consular dignity, says 'he was accused of atheism, and put to death for turning to the Jews' religion;' which, as Baronius[49] and others observe, must mean the Christian religion, for which he was a martyr. So, when Suetonius says[50], 'that Claudius expelled the Jews from Rome, because they grew tumultuous by the instigations of Chrestus,' it is generally concluded by learned men[51], that under the name of Jews he also comprehends the Christians. In like manner when Spartian[52] says of Caracalla's play-fellow, that 'he was of the Jewish religion,' he doubtless means the Christian; for as much as Tertullian[53] tells us, that Caracalla himself was nursed by a Christian.

[47] L. 7. c. 30. (v. 1. p. 364. 4.) Ἀλλὰ γὰρ μηδαμῶς ἐκστῆναι τοῦ Παύλου τοῦ τῆς ἐκκλησίας οἴκου θέλοντος, βασιλεὺς ἐντευχθεὶς Αὐρηλιανὸς αἰσιώτατα περὶ τοῦ πρακτέου διείληφε· τούτοις νεῖμαι προστάττων τὸν οἶκον, οἷς ἂν οἱ κατὰ τὴν Ἰταλίαν καὶ τὴν Ῥωμαίων πόλιν ἐπίσκοποι τοῦ δόγματος ἐπιστέλλοιεν.

[48] Dio [l. 67.] in Domit. (p. 766 a. 3.) Κἂν τῷ αὐτῷ ἔτει ἄλλους τε πολλοὺς καὶ τὸν Φάβιον Κλήμεντα ὑπατεύοντα, καίπερ ἀνεψίον ὄντα, καὶ γυναῖκα καὶ αὐτὴν συγγενῆ ἑαυτοῦ Φλαβίαν Δομιτίλλαν ἔχοντα, κατέσφαξεν ὁ Δομιτιανός. Ἐπηνέχθη δὲ ἀμφοῖν ἔγκλημα ἀθεότητος ὑφ' ἧς καὶ ἄλλοι εἰς τὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἤθη ἐξοκέλλοντες πολλοὶ κατεδικάσθησαν. . . . . Τὸν δὲ δὴ Γλαβρίωνα, τὸν μετὰ τοῦ Τραϊανοῦ ἄρξοντα, κατηγορηθέντα τά τε ἄλλα, καὶ οἷα οἱ πολλοὶ, καὶ ὅτι καὶ θηρίοις ἐμάχετο, ἀπέκτεινεν.

[49] An. 94. n. 1. (t. 1. p. 724 e.) At quod spectat ad Glabrionem, scribit Dio eum una cum nonnullis aliis, illato crimine ἀθεότητος, quod ad Judæorum mores transisset, (sic enim, ut sæpius dictum est, quod ex Judæis descenderent, Christianos Ethnici appellabant,) etc.

[50] Vit. Claud. c. 25. (p. 219.) Judæos, impulsore Chresto, assiduo tumultuantes Roma expulit.

[51] Hottinger, H. E. t. 1. (p. 37.)—Basnag. Exercit. in Baron. (p. 139.)—Seld. de Synedr. l. 1. c. 8. who cites Lipsius, Petavius, and many others.

[52] Vit. Caracal. c. 1. (int. Aug. Hist. Script. p. 404.) Cum collusorem suum puerum ob Judaicam religionem gravius verberatum audisset, etc.

[53] Ad Scap. c. 4. (p. 71 a.) Quem et Antoninus optime noverat lacte Christiano educatus. [al. noverat Christianis educatum. Ed.]

Christ by the heathens commonly called *Chrestus*, and Christians, *Chrestians*.

11. The heathens committed another mistake in the pronunciation of our Saviour's name, whom they generally called *Chrestus*, instead of Christus; and his followers *Chrestians* for Christians; which is taken notice of by Justin Martyr[54], Tertullian[55], Lactantius[56], and some others, who correct their mistake; though they have no great quarrel with them upon this account, for both names are of good signification. *Christus* is the same with the Hebrew *Messias*, and signifies 'a person anointed to be a priest or king;' and *Chrestus*, being the same with the Greek Χρηστὸς, implies 'sweetness and goodness.' Whence Tertullian[57] tells them, that they were unpardonable for prosecuting Christians merely for their name, because both names were innocent, and of excellent signification.

The Christians, therefore, did not wholly reject this name, though it was none of their own imposing; as neither did they refuse to be called *Jews*, in that sense as the Scripture uses the word, to distinguish the people of God from the synagogue of Satan, Rev. ii. 9. Though to avoid the subtleties of the Ebionites and Nazarenes, who were for blending the ceremonies of the Law with the faith of the Gospel, they rather chose to avoid that name, and stuck to the name of Christians.

CHAP. II.

Of the names of reproach which the Jews, Infidels, and Heretics cast upon the Christians.

Christians called *Nazarenes* by the Jews and Heathens.

1. Besides the names already spoken of, there were some other reproachful names cast upon them by their adversaries, which it will not be improper here to mention. The first of these was *Nazarenes;* a name of reproach given them first by the Jews, by whom they are styled *the sect of the Nazarenes,*

[54] Apol. l. 2. (p. 54 a.) Ὅσον τε ἐκ τοῦ κατηγορουμένου ἡμῶν ὀνόματος, χρηστότατοι ὑπάρχομεν.

[55] Apol. c. 3. (p. 4 d.) Nunc igitur, si nominis odium est, quis nominum reatus? Quæ accusatio vocabulorum, nisi si aut barbarum sonat aliqua vox nominis, aut infaustum, aut maledicum, aut impudicum? Christianus vero, quantum interpretatio est, de unctione deducitur. Sed et cum perperam Christianus [leg. Chrestianus] pronuntiatur a vobis, nam nec nominis certa est notitia penes vos, de suavitate vel benignitate compositum est. Oditur ergo [al. itaque] vel in hominibus innocuis nomen innocuum.

[56] Instit. l. 4. c. 7. (t. 1. p. 287.) Sed exponenda hujus nominis ratio est, propter ignorantium errorem, qui eum immutata litera Chrestum solent dicere.

[57] See note 55.

Acts xxiv. 5. There was, indeed, a particular heresy, who called themselves Ναζωραῖοι: and Epiphanius[58] thinks the Jews had a more especial spite at them, because they were a sort of Jewish apostates, who kept circumcision and the Mosaical rites together with the Christian religion; and therefore, he says, 'they were used to curse and anathematize them three times a day, morning, noon, and evening, when they met in their synagogues to pray, in this direful form of execration,—'Ἐπικαταράσαι ὁ Θεὸς τοὺς Ναζωραίους, *Send thy curse, O God, upon the Nazarenes.*' But St. Jerom[59] says this was levelled at Christians in general, whom they thus 'anathematized under the name of Nazarenes.' This seems most probable, because, as both St. Jerom[60] and Epiphanius[61] himself observe, the Jews termed all Christians, by way of reproach, *Nazarenes;* and the Gentiles took it from the Jews, as appears from that of Datianus, the prætor, in Prudentius[62], where, speaking to the Christians, he gives them the name of *Nazarenes.* Some[63] think the Christians at first were very free to own this name, and esteemed it no reproach, till such time as the heresy of the Nazarenes broke out, and then in detestation of that heresy they forsook that name, and called themselves Christians, Acts xi. 26. But whether this be said according to the exact rules of chronology, I leave those who are better skilled to determine.

[58] Hær. 29. Nazar. n. 9. (t. 1. p. 124 c.) Οὐ μόνον γὰρ οἱ τῶν Ἰουδαίων παῖδες πρὸς τούτους κέκτηνται μῖσος, ἀλλὰ ἀπιστάμενοι ἔσωθεν καὶ μέσης ἡμέρας, καὶ περὶ τὴν ἑσπέραν, τρὶς τῆς ἡμέρας ὅτε εὐχὰς ἐπιτελοῦσιν ἐν ταῖς αὐτῶν συναγωγαῖς, ἐπαρῶνται αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἀναθεματίζουσι φάσκοντες, ὅτι Ἐπικαταράσαι ὁ Θεὸς τοὺς Ναζωραίους.

[59] In Esai. 49. t. 5. p. 178. (t. 4. p. 565 d.) Ipse enim bonus pastor posuit animam suam pro ovibus suis, et contemsit eam, qui abominationi est genti Judæorum, cui ter per singulos dies sub nomine Nazarenorum maledicunt in synagogis suis.

[60] De Loc. Hebr. t. 3. p. 289. (t. 3. p. 255.) .... Et nos apud veteres, quasi opprobrio Nazaræi dicebamur, quos nunc Christianos vocant.

[61] Ut supr. n. 1. (t. 1. p. 117 a.) Καὶ πάντες δὲ Χριστιανοὶ Ναζωραῖοι τότε ὡσαύτως ἐκαλοῦντο.

[62] Peristeph. Hymn. V. de S. Vincent. Mart. vv. 25, 26. (v. 1. p. 243.)
Vos, Nazareni, assistite,
Rudemque ritum spernite.
It. Hymn. X. de S. Rom. Mart. vv. 41—45. (p. 309.)
Præfectus istis imminens negotiis
Asclepiades, ire mandat milites
Ecclesiasten usque de sacrariis
Raptare plebem, mancipandam vinculis,
Ni disciplinam Nazarenam respuat.

[63] Junius, Parall. l. 1. c. 8. (t. 1. p. 1010. 52.) Quod impium dogma quum Antiochiæ primum invaluerit, fortasse occasionem Antiochenæ Ecclesiæ dedit, ut viri boni se non amplius Nazaræos aut Nazarenos, sed Christianos potius appellarent.—See

15. 2. Another name of reproach was that of *Galilæans*, which was Julian's ordinary style, whenever he spake of Christ or Christians. Thus in his dialogue with old Maris, a blind Christian bishop, mentioned by Sozomen[64], he told him by way of scoff, 'Thy Galilæan God will not cure thee.' And again, in his Epistle to Arsacius[65], high priest of Galatia, 'the Galilæans maintain their own poor and ours also.' The like may be observed in Socrates[66], Theodoret[67], Chrysostom[68], and Gregory Nazianzen[69], who adds, 'that he not only called them Galilæans himself, but made a law that no one should call them by any other name; thinking thereby to abolish the name of Christians.'

the- 3. They also called them *Atheists*, and their religion *the atheism* or *impiety*, because they derided the worship of the heathen gods. Dio[70] says Acilius Glabrio was put to death for *atheism*, meaning the Christian religion; and the Christian Apologists, Athenagoras[71], Justin Martyr[72], Arnobius[73], and

also Godwyn's Moses and Aaron, b. 1. ch. 8. Lond. 1667. And hence it is thought that the Church at Antioch, in detestation of this newbred heresy, fastened on them by the name of Nazarites, forsook that name, and called themselves Christians, &c. (Lond. 1685. p. 33.)

[64] L. 5. c. 4. (v. 2. p. 185. 34.) ... Οὐδὲ ὁ Γαλιλαῖός σου Θεὸς, εἶπε, θεραπεύσει σε.

[65] Ap. Soz. l. 5. c. 16. (v. 2. p. 204. 14.) Αἰσχρὸν γὰρ, εἰ τῶν μὲν Ἰουδαίων οὐδεὶς μεταιτεῖ, τρέφουσι δὲ οἱ δυσσεβεῖς Γαλιλαῖοι πρὸς τοῖς ἑαυτῶν καὶ τοὺς ἡμετέρους.

[66] L. 3. c. 12. (v. 2. p. 187. 24.) Γαλιλαῖον γὰρ εἰώθει ὁ Ἰουλιανὸς καλεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν, καὶ τοὺς Χριστιανοὺς Γαλιλαίους.

[67] L. 3. c. 8. (v. 3. p. 129. 37.) ... Ἀπηγόρευσε τῶν Γαλιλαίων τοὺς παῖδας, οὕτω γὰρ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θιασώτας ὠνόμαζε, ποιητικῶν καὶ ῥητορικῶν καὶ φιλοσόφων μεταλαγχάνειν λόγων.

Ibid. c. 21. (p. 140. 36.) ... Τοὺς δὲ Χριστιανοὺς Γαλιλαίους ὠνόμαζεν, κ. τ. λ.

It. c. 25. (p. 143. 24.) .... Νενίκηκας, Γαλιλαῖε.

[68] Hom. 63. (t. 2. p. 532 c.) Καὶ οὐδὲ ἐνταῦθα τῆς μανίας ἵστατο, ἀλλ' ἐκ μέσης ἀναρπάσασθαι τῆς οἰκουμένης τὸ τῶν Γαλιλαίων ἔθνος ἐπηγγέλλετο, καὶ γὰρ οὕτως ἡμᾶς εἰώθει καλεῖν.

[69] Orat. 3. [adv. Julian. Invect. 1.] (t. 1. p. 81 b.) Καινοτομεῖ περὶ τὴν προσηγορίαν, Γαλιλαίους ἀντὶ Χριστιανῶν ὀνομάσας τε καὶ καλεῖσθαι νομοθετήσας.

[70] See before, ch. 1. sect. 10. p. 11. n. 48.

[71] Legat. pro Christ. (ad calc. Just. Mart. p. 4 c.) Τρία ἐπιφημίζουσιν ἡμῖν ἐγκλήματα, Ἀθεότητα, Θυέστεια δεῖπνα, Οἰδιποδείους μίξεις.

[72] Apol. 1. (p. 47 a.) Ὅς γε περὶ ἡμῶν ἃ μὴ ἐπίσταται δημοσίᾳ καταμαρτυρεῖ ὡς ἀθέων καὶ ἀσεβῶν Χριστιανῶν.

[73] Cont. Gent. l. 1. (p. 1.) Neque enim negaverim validissimam esse accusationem istam, (nempe, postquam esse in mundo Christiana gens cœpit, terrarum orbem perisse, multiformibus malis affectum esse genus humanum &c.) hostilibusque condignos odiis nos esse, si apud nos esse constiterit causas, per quas suis mundus aberravit a legibus, exterminata sunt Dii longe, examina tanta mœrorum mortalium

others, reckon this among the crimes which the heathens usually lay to their charge. Eusebius says[74] 'the name was become so common, that when the persecuting magistrates would oblige a Christian to renounce his religion, they bade him abjure it in this form, by saying, among other things, Αἶρε τοὺς Ἀθέους, *Confusion to the Atheists, Away with the impious,*' meaning the Christians.

4. To this they added the name of *Greeks* and *Impostors;* which is noted by St. Jerom[75], who says, wheresoever they saw a Christian, they would presently cry out, Ὁ γραικὸς ἐπιθέτης, *Behold a Grecian impostor!* This was the character which the Jews gave our Saviour, Ὁ πλανὸς, *that deceiver.* Matt. xxvii. 63. And Justin Martyr says[76] 'they endeavoured to propagate it to posterity, sending their apostles or emissaries from Jerusalem to all the synagogues in the world, to bid them beware of a certain impious, lawless sect, lately risen up under one Jesus, a Galilæan impostor.' Hence Lucian[77] took occasion in his blasphemous raillery to style him, *the crucified sophister.* And Celsus[78] commonly gives him and his followers the name of γοηταὶ[79], *deceivers.* So Asclepiades, the judge, in Prudentius[80],

And *Greeks* and *Impostors.*

importata sunt sæculis... Efficitur enim profecto rationum consequentium copulatu, ut non impii nos, magis sed illi ipsi reperiantur criminis istius rei, qui se numinum profitentur esse cultores, atque inveteratis religionibus deditos.

[74] L. 4. c. 15. (v. 1. p. 167. 12.) Ὁμοσον τὴν Καίσαρος τύχην, μετανόησον· εἶπον Αἶρε τοὺς ἀθέους.

[75] Ep. 10. [al. 54.] ad Fur. (t. 1. p. 282 c.) Ubicunque viderint Christianum, statim illud de trivio ὁ γραικὸς, ὁ ἐπιθέτης.

[76] Dial. c. Tryph. (p. 335 c.) Οὐ μόνον οὐ μετανοήσατε μαθόντες αὐτὸν ἀναστάντα ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἀλλ'... ἄνδρας χειροτονήσαντες ἐκλεκτοὺς εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐπέμψατε, κηρύσσοντας ὅτι αἵρεσίς τις ἄθεος καὶ ἄνομος ἐγήγερται ἀπὸ Ἰησοῦ τινὸς Γαλιλαίου πλάνου, κ. τ. λ.

[77] De Mort. Peregrin. (v. 8. p. 280.) ....Ἐπειδὰν ἅπαξ παραβάντες (οἱ Χριστιανοὶ) θεοὺς μὲν Ἑλληνικοὺς ἀπαρνήσωνται, τὸν δὲ ἀνεσκολοπισμένον ἐκεῖνον σοφιστὴν αὐτῶν προσκυνῶσι, καὶ κατὰ τοὺς ἐκείνου νόμους βιῶσι. Καταφρονοῦσιν οὖν ἁπάντων κ. τ. λ.

[78] Ap. Orig. l. 1. p. 20. (t. 1. p. 344. 6. n. 26.) .... Λεγέτω ὁ ἐπαγγελλόμενος εἰδέναι τὰ Χριστιανῶν καὶ Ἰουδαίων. Πῶς δὲ καὶ γοητεία παρὰ τοῖς παραδεξαμένοις τὸν Μωϋσέως νόμον ἐστὶν κ. τ. λ. [Ibid. p. 55. (p. 384 d. n. 71.) Εἶτά φησι λοιδορούμενος τῷ Ἰησοῦ .... ὅτι ταῦτα θεομισοῦς ἦν τινος καὶ μοχθηροῦ γόητος. *Grischov.*]

[79] [Or rather γόητες, from γόης. I am not aware of the form γοητής. Hesychius, Suidas, and Pollux have γόης, *assentator, impostor, seductor.* The term occurs 2 Tim. 3, 13. Πονηροὶ δὲ ἄνθρωποι καὶ γόητες κ. τ. λ. not γοηταί. Vid. Suicer. in voc. γόης et γοητεία. Ed.]

[80] Peristeph. H. 10. de Rom. Mart. v. 404. (v. 1. p. 339.)

Quis hos sophistas error invexit novus,
Qui non colendos esse divos disputent?

compliments them with the appellation of *sophisters;* and Ulpian[81] proscribes them in a law by the name of *impostors.*

The reason why they added the name of *Greeks* to that of impostors was (as learned men[82] conjecture) because many of the Christian philosophers took upon them the Grecian or philosophic habit, which was the *περιβόλαιον*, or *pallium.* Whence the Greeks were called *Palliati*, as the Romans were called *Togati*, or *Gens Togata*, from their proper habit, which was the *toga.* Now, it being some offence to the Romans to see the Christians quit the Roman gown to wear the Grecian cloak, they thence took occasion to mock and deride them with the scurrilous names of *Greeks*, and *Grecian impostors.* Tertullian's book, *de Pallio*, was written to show the spiteful malice of this foolish objection.

gicians. 5. But the heathens went one step further in their malice; and because our Saviour and his followers did many miracles, which they imputed to evil arts and the power of magic, they therefore generally declaimed against them as *magicians*, and under that character exposed them to the fury of the vulgar. Celsus[83] and others pretended that our Saviour studied magic

[81] Digest. l. 1. tit. 13. leg. 1. n. 3. (t. 3. p. 1781.) Si incantavit, si imprecatus est, si, ut vulgari verbo impostorum utar, exorcitavit.

[82] Kortholt. de Vit. et Mor. Christ. c. 3. (p. 22.) where he cites Hieron. Ep. 19. ad Marcell. *Si tunica non canduerit, statim illud de tririo, Impostor et Græcus est.* Also Ep. 10. ad Fur. (see before, p. 15. not. 75.) adding Quæ Sancti Patres loca ut recte intelligantur, sciendum Romanorum habitum proprie fuisse *togam*, sicut Græcorum *pallium*.... Hinc Romani dicti sunt *gens togata* .... contra Græci *palliati* .... quia proinde Græcorum pallio etiam vestiebantur Christiani, ... hinc communi scommate audiebant *Græci!* et ab injectione pallii, quod tunicæ superimponebant etiam Ἐπιθέται! hoc est, ut ita dixerim, *Imponentes!* Id simpliciter accipiebat indoctum vulgus ob pallii superimpositionem: cæterum literati figuratum morsum intelligebant in vocabulo, ἐπιθέτης, quo fieret ad *impostoris* nomen apud Latinos tacita allusio, hoc est, deceptoris et hominis sanctitatem mentientis.—Baron. An. 56. n. 11. (t. 1. p. 430 e.) Quod ait [Ulpianus] verbum *exorcizare* esse impostorum, haud dubium est sugillare voluisse Christianos.

[83] Cont. Cels. l. 1. p. 30. (t. 1. p. 356 b. n. 38.) .... φησὶ γὰρ αὐτὸν σκότιον τραφέντα, μισθαρνήσαντα εἰς Αἴγυπτον, δυνάμεών τινων πειρασθέντα, ἐκεῖθεν ἐπανελθεῖν, Θεὸν δι' ἐκείνας· τὰς δυνάμεις ἑαυτὸν ἀναγορεύοντα. [Conf. ibid. p. 346 d. e. n. 28.] Arnob. l. 1. p. 36. (p. 25.) Occursurus forsitan rursus est cum aliis multis calumniosis illis et puerilibus vocibus,—Magus fuit, clandestinis artibus omnia illa perfecit; Ægyptiorum ex adytis angelorum potentium nomina, et semotas furatus est disciplinas. Quid dicitis...? Ergone illa, quæ gesta sunt, dæmonum fuere præstigiæ et magicarum artium ludi.

ɔpt; and St. Austin[84] says it was generally believed the heathen, that he wrote some books about magic ich he delivered to Peter and Paul for the use of his s. Hence it was that Suetonius[85], speaking in the lan- of his party, calls the Christians, *genus hominum su- ionis maleficæ, the men of the magical superstition.* lepiades, the judge in Prudentius[86], styles St. Romanus, rtyr, *arch-magician.* And St. Ambrose observes in sion of St. Agnes[87], how the people cried out against Away with the sorceress! away with the enchanter!' g being more common than to term all Christians, espe- uch as wrought miracles[88], by the odious name of *sor-* and *magicians.*

The *new superstition* was another name of reproach Christian religion. Suetonius gives it that title[89], ny[90] and Tacitus[91] add to it the opprobrious terms of *and unreasonable superstition.* By which name also riumphed over it, in his trophies, which he set up at when he had harassed the Christians with a most se- ersecution. He gloried that he had 'purged the country ers, and those that obtruded and inculcated the new ition[92] upon mankind.' By this there can be no doubt unt the Christians, whose religion is called *the supersti-*

The *new superstition.*

Consens. Evang. l. 1. c. 9. rt. 2. p. 7 g. et p. 8 a.) Ita i desipiunt, ut illis libris, m scripsisse existimant, di- tineri eas artes, quibus eum illa fecisse miracula, etc.— 10. (p. 8 b.) Quid? quod vino judicio sic errant qui- rum, qui talia Christum e vel credunt, vel credi vo- eosdem libros ad Petrum et dicant tamquam epistolari senotatos.

. Neron. c. 16. (P. 240.) ... supplicii Christiani, genus n superstitionis novæ ac ....

isteph. H. 10. de S. Rom. 868. (v. 1. p. 368.)

sque tandem summus hic is magus

t, inquit, Thessalarum car- e,

Pœnam peritus vertere in ludi- brium?

[87] Serm. 90. in S. Agn. [int. Ep. Segreg. Ep. 1. n. 12.] (t. 2. append. p. 482 d.) Tolle magam, tolle male- ficam.

[88] Vid. Kortholt. de Vit. et Mor. Christ. c. 4. tot. (pp. 19 seqq.) *De Magia Christo hujusque cultoribus objecta.*

[89] See n. 85. preceding.

[90] L. 10. Ep. 97. (p. 279.) Nihil aliud inveni quam superstitionem pravam et immodicam.

[91] Annal. l. 15. c. 44. (v. 2. p. 379.) Exitiabilis superstitio.

[92] Inscript. Antiq. ad calcem Sueton. (Oxon. 1661. 12mo.) NERONI. CLAUD. CAIS. AUG. PONT. MAX. OB. PROVINC. LATRONIB. ET. HIS. QUI. NOVAM. GENERI. HUM. SUPERSTITION. INCULCAB. PURGAT.

tion in other Inscriptions of the like nature. See that of Diocletian, cited in Baronius, an. 304, from Occo;—*Superstitione Christianorum ubique deleta, &c.*

Not much unlike this was that other name which Porphyry[93] and some others give it, when they call it *the barbarous, new, and strange religion.* In the Acts of the famous martyrs of Lyons[94], who suffered under Antoninus Pius, the heathens scornfully insult it with this character. For having burnt the martyrs to ashes, and scattered their remains into the river Rhone, they said, 'they did it to cut off their hopes of a resurrection, upon the strength of which they sought to obtrude the new and strange religion upon mankind; but now let us see whether they will rise again, and whether their God can help and deliver them out of our hands.'

Christians, why called *Sibyllists.*

7. Celsus gives them the name of *Sibyllists*[95], because the Christians, in their disputes with the heathens, sometimes made use of the authority of Sibylla, their own prophetess, against them; whose writings they urged with so much advantage to the Christian cause, and prejudice to the heathen, that Justin Martyr[96] says the Roman governors made it death for any one to read them, or Hystaspes, or the writings of the prophets.

Biathanati.

8. They also reproached them with the appellation of *βιαθάνατοι, self-murderers*, because they readily offered themselves up to martyrdom, and cheerfully underwent any violent death, which the heathens could inflict upon them. With what eagerness they courted death, we learn not only from the Christian writers themselves[97], but from the testimonies of the heathens[98]

[93] Ap. Euseb. l. 6. c. 19. (v. 1. p. 281. 8.) Ὠριγένης δὲ Ἕλλην .... πρὸς τὸ βάρβαρον ἐξώκειλε τόλμημα.

[94] Ap. Euseb. l. 5. c. 1. (v. 1. p. 210. 36.) Καὶ ταῦτ' ἔπραττον, ὡς δυνάμενοι νικῆσαι τὸν Θεὸν, καὶ ἀφελέσθαι αὐτῶν τὴν παλιγγενεσίαν, ἵνα ὡς ἔλεγον ἐκεῖνοι, μηδὲ ἐλπίδα σχῶσιν ἀναστάσεως, ἐφ' ᾗ πεποιθότες, ξένην τινὰ καὶ καινὴν ἡμῖν εἰσάγουσι θρησκείαν, καὶ καταφρονοῦσι τῶν δεινῶν, ἕτοιμοι καὶ μετὰ χαρᾶς ἥκοντες ἐπὶ τὸν θάνατον· νῦν ἴδωμεν εἰ ἀναστήσονται, καὶ εἰ δύναται βοηθῆσαι αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεὸς αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐξελέσθαι ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν ἡμῶν.

[95] Cont. Cels. l. 5. c. 272. (t. 1. p. 625 a. n. 61.) Εἶπε δέ τινας εἶναι καὶ Σιβυλλιστὰς, τάχα παρακούσας τινῶν ἐγκαλούντων τοῖς οἰομένοις προφῆτιν γεγονέναι τὴν Σιβύλλαν, καὶ Σιβυλλιστὰς τοὺς τοιούτους καλεσάντων.

[96] Apol. 2. (p. 82 b.) Κατ' ἐνέργειαν τῶν φαύλων δαιμόνων θάνατος ὡρίσθη κατὰ τῶν τὰς Ὑστάσπου, ἢ Σιβύλλης, ἢ τῶν προφητῶν βίβλους ἀναγινωσκόντων.

[97] See these collected in Pearson, Vindic. Ignat. part. 2. c. 9. (ap. Cotel. v. 2. append. p. 384.)

[98] Arr. Antonin. ap. Tertul. ad Scap. c. 5. (p. 71 c.) Crudelitas vestra gloria est nostra. Vide tantum ne hoc ipso, quod talia sustinemus,

concerning them. Lucian[99] says, 'they not only despised death, but many of them voluntarily offered themselves to it, out of a persuasion that they should be made immortal, and live for ever.' This he reckons folly, and therefore gives them the name of κακοδαίμονες, *the miserable wretches that threw away their lives.* In which sense Porphyry[1] also styles the Christian religion, βάρβαρον τόλμημα, *the barbarous boldness.* As Arrius Antoninus[2] terms the professors of it ὦ δειλοὶ, *the stupid wretches that had such a mind to die;* and the Heathen, in Minucius[3], *homines deploratæ ac desperatæ factionis, the men of the forlorn and desperate faction!* All of which agrees with the name *biathanati* or *biæothanati*, as Baronius[4] understands it. Though it may signify not only *self-murderers*, but (as a learned critic[5] notes) *men that expect to live after death.*

ad hoc solum videamur erumpere, ut hoc ipsum probemus, nos hæc non timere, sed ultro vocare. Arrius Antoninus in Asia cum persequeretur instanter, omnes illius civitatis Christiani ante tribunalia ejus se, manu facta, obtulerunt: cum ille, paucis duci jussis, reliquis ait, Ὦ δειλοὶ, εἰ θέλετε ἀποθνήσκειν, κρημνοὺς ἢ βροχοὺς ἔχετε. Hoc si placuerit et hic [Carthagine] fieri, quid facies de tantis millibus hominum, tot viris ac feminis, omnis sexus, omnis ætatis, omnis dignitatis, offerentibus se tibi? Quantis ignibus, quantis gladiis opus erit? Quid ipsa Carthago passura est? decimanda a te....?

[99] De Mort. Peregrin. (v. 8. p. 280.) Πεπείκασι γὰρ αὐτοὺς οἱ κακοδαίμονες, τὸ μὲν ὅλον, ἀθάνατοι ἔσεσθαι, καὶ βιώσεσθαι τὸν ἀεὶ χρόνον, παρ' ὃ καὶ καταφρονοῦσι τοῦ θανάτου, καὶ ἑκόντες αὐτοὺς ἐπιδιδόασιν οἱ πολλοί.

[1] Ap. Euseb. l. 6. c. 19. See before p. 18. n. 93.

[2] See n. 98.

[3] Octav. c. 8. (p. 48.) Quid? homines.... homines, inquam, deploratæ, illicitæ, ac desperatæ factionis grassari in Deos, non ingemiscendum est?

[4] An. 138. n. 5. (t. 2. p. 96 e.) Vox Græca in Latinitatem transiit a βιαίῳ θανάτῳ, id est, violenta morte.

[The term βιαιοθάνατος, which is a pure and classical word, occurs in Tertullian, de Anima, c. 57. where he applies it to such persons as have come to a premature and violent end by their own hands or otherwise;—Itaque invocantur quidem ἄωροι et βιαιοθάνατοι sub illo fidei argumento, quod credibile videatur, eas potissimum animas ad vim et injuriam facere, quas per vim et injuriam *sævus et immaturus* finis extorsit quasi ad vicem offensæ.

Βιαθάνατος is evidently vox nihili, and βιοθάνατος and βιοθανάτεω, which occur in the Acta Martyrum, in Gregentius, in Chrysostom, (Hom. 36. under the title, Ὅτι αἱ ψυχαὶ τῶν βιοθανάτων οὐ γίνονται δαίμονες) and elsewhere, are *glossæ* of a later age. See Du Fresne's Glossarium Med. et Inf. Græcitat. Lugdun. 1688. t. 1. p. 201. in voce, Βιοθάνατοι = qui judicum decretis damnati mortem violentam subierunt. Ed.]

[5] Suicer. Thes. Eccles. in voc. βιοθάνατος (t. 1. p. 690.)

[Mamachius, Orig. et Antiq. Christ. l. i. n. 12. (v. 1. p. 87. Rom. 1749.) finds fault with Suicer for this conceit, for which no authority is found, and which cannot be derived from the legitimate power of the term itself, as being compounded, not of βίος, but of βίαιος and θάνατος.

In which sense the heathens probably might use it likewise, to ridicule the Christian doctrine of the resurrection; on which, they knew, all their fearless and undaunted courage was founded. For so the same Heathen, in Minucius[6], endeavours to expose at once both their resolution and their belief:—'O strange folly and incredible madness!' says he, 'they despise all present torments, and yet fear those that are future and uncertain: they are afraid of dying after death, but in the mean time do not fear to die. So vainly do they flatter themselves, and allay their fears, with the hopes of some reviving comforts after death.' For one of these reasons then they gave them the name of *biothanati*, which word expressly occurs in some of the Acts of the ancient martyrs. Baronius observes[7], out of Bede's Martyrology, that when the seven sons of Symphorosa were martyred under Hadrian, their bodies were all cast into one pit together, which the temple-priests named from them *Ad septem biothanatos, the grave of the seven biothanati.*

bolarii despe- 9. For the same reasons they gave them the names of *parabolarii* and *desperati, the bold and desperate men.* The *parabolarii* or *parabolani* among the Romans were those bold adventurous men, who hired out themselves to fight with wild beasts upon the stage or amphitheatre, whence they had also the name of *bestiarii* and *confectores.* Now, because the Christians were put to fight for their lives in the same manner,

Mamachius says,—Neque enim Suicero assentior, qui etiam *biothanatos* dici potuisse Christianos putat, *quasi viri mortui essent*, propterea quod morte se consequuturos immortalitatem esse sperarent. Nam etsi ejusmodi eorum spes erat, qui tamen *biothanati* vocabulo hoc genus significationis tribuerit, reperio certe neminem. Quod autem profert Luciani locum, (Πεπείκασι γὰρ αὐτοὺς, κ. τ. λ. See n. 99. p. 19.) nego esse illi præsidio posse. Efficitur namque eo ipso loco, majores nostros mortem pro Christi nomine magno animo contemsisse; inde vero *biothanatos* esse dictos, nullo modo prorsus efficitur. Cumque hujus simile sit Minucii testimonium, (see the next note,) quo Binghamus utitur ad eandem rem demonstrandam; non est cur ullo vetere monumento constitui eam sententiam posse arbitremur. Ed.]

[6] Ut supr. c. 8. (p. 52.) Proh! mira stultitia et incredibilis audacia! spernunt tormenta præsentia, dum incerta metuunt et futura: et dum mori post mortem timent, interim mori non timent. Ita illis pavorem [al. pavor et] fallax spes solatia rediviva blanditur. [For the various readings of the last clause, see the able annotation of Davies on the passage. Perhaps the best reading would be,—Ita illis pavorem fallax spes solatio redivivo blanditur. Ed.]

[7] An. 138. n. 5. See sect. 8. p. 19. n. 4.

and they rather chose to do it than deny their religion, they therefore got the name of *paraboli* and *parabolani;* which, though it was intended as a name of reproach and mockery, yet the Christians were not unwilling to take it to themselves, being one of the truest characters that the heathens ever gave them. And, therefore, they sometimes gave themselves this name by way of allusion to the Roman *paraboli,* as in the passion of Abdo and Senne[8] in the time of Valerian, the martyrs, who were exposed to be devoured by wild beasts in the amphitheatre, are said to enter, *ut audacissimi parabolani, as most resolute champions,* that despised their own lives for their religion's sake. But the other name of *desperati* they rejected as a calumny, retorting it back upon their adversaries, who more justly deserved it. 'Those,' says Lactantius[9], 'who set a value upon their faith, and will not deny their God, they first torment and butcher them with all their might, and then call them *desperadoes,* because they will not spare their own bodies; as if any thing could be more desperate than to torture and tear in pieces those, whom you cannot but know to be innocent.'

10. Tertullian[10] mentions another name, which was likewise occasioned by their sufferings. The martyrs, which were burnt alive, were usually tied to a board or stake of about six feet long, which the Romans called *semaxis;* and then they were *Sarmen. and semaxii.*

[8] Ap. Suicer. Thes. Eccles. in voc. παραβολάνοι (t. 2. pp. 565, 566.)

[Suicer shews that those persons were properly called παραβολάνοι, who were deputed to attend upon the sick in dangerous diseases. (See afterwards, b. 3. c. 9. § 3.) After correcting a reading in the first Act of the Council of Chalcedon, he adds,—Sic dicti, ut ait summus Novellarum interpres, quasi *temerarii;* quod, qui ægrotis adsunt, in periculis sæpe non parvis versentur, frequenti ægrotorum contactu: eadem nimirum forma rationeque, qua *bestiarii* parabolarii sunt, et Socrati παράβολοι, i. e. *audaces* .... Potest etiam verti *parabolani,* quomodo vocantur in Actis Passionis SS. Martyrum Abdonis et Sennes:—Tunc jussit Valerianus eos introduci in amphitheatrum, ut ferarum morsibus consumerentur. Et cum ut *audacissimi parabolani* ingressi fuissent &c. Ed.]

[9] Instit. l. 5. c. 9. (t. 1. p. 383.) .... In eos vero totis carnificinæ suæ viribus, veluti sanguinem sitiant, incumbunt; et desperatos vocant, quia corpori suo minime parcunt: quasi quicquam desperatius esse possit, quam torquere ac dilaniare eum, quem scias esse innocentem.

[10] Apol. c. 50. (p. 39 c.) Licet nunc sarmenticios et semaxios [al. semassios, semissarios, sarmentarios et semiaxios vel semiaxiarios.] appelletis, quia ad stipitem dimidii axis revincti sarmentorum ambitu exurimur: hic est habitus victoriæ nostræ, hæc palmata vestis; tali cursu triumphamus.

surrounded or covered with fagots of small wood, which they called *sarmenta*. From this, their punishment, the heathens, who turned every thing into mockery, gave all Christians the despiteful name of *sarmentitii* and *semaxii*.

Lucifugax natio.

11. The Heathen, in Minucius[11], takes occasion also to reproach them under the name of *the sculking generation*, or *the men that loved to prate in corners and the dark*. The ground of which scurrilous reflection was only this, that they were forced to hold their religious assemblies in the night, to avoid the fury of the persecutions; which Celsus[12] himself owns, though otherwise prone enough to load them with hard names and odious reflections.

Plautina prosapia, and *pistores.*

12. The same Heathen, in Minucius, gives them one scurrilous name more, which it is not very easy to guess the meaning of. He calls them *Plautinians*[13], *homines Plautinæ prosapiæ*. Rigaltius[14] takes it for a ridicule upon the poverty and simplicity of the Christians, whom the heathens commonly represented as a company of poor ignorant mechanics, bakers, tailors, and the like; men of the same quality with Plautus, who, as St. Jerom[15] observes, was so poor, that in a time of famine he was forced to hire out himself to a baker to grind at his mill, during which time he wrote three of his plays in the intervals of his labour. Such sort of men Cæcilius says the Christians were; and therefore he styles Octavius in the dialogue, *homo Plautinæ prosapiæ, et pistorum præcipuus, a Plautinian, a chief man among the illiterate bakers, but no philosopher*. The same reflection is often made by Celsus. 'You shall see,' says he[16], 'weavers, tailors, fullers, and the most illiterate and

[11] Octav. p. 25. (c. 8. p. 50.) Latebrosa et lucifugax natio, in publicum muta, in angulis garrula; templa ut busta despiciunt etc.

[12] Cont. Cels. l. 1. p. 5. (t. 1. p. 322 a. n. 3.) Μετὰ ταῦτα περὶ τοῦ κρύφα Χριστιανοὺς τὰ ἀρέσκοντα ἑαυτοῖς ποιεῖν καὶ διδάσκειν εἰπὼν, καὶ ὅτι οὐ μάτην τοῦτο ποιοῦσιν, ἅτε διωθούμενοι τὴν ἐπηρτημένην αὐτοῖς δίκην τοῦ θανάτου κ. τ. λ.

[13] Octav. p. 37. (c. 14. p. 73.) .. .. Et quid ad hæc, ait, audet Octavius, homo Plautinæ prosapiæ, ut pistorum præcipuus, ita postremus philosophorum.

[14] In loc. (ibid. n. 7.) Hoc vero pistrinensis militiæ probrum torquet in Octavium Cæcilius ob religionis Christianæ simplicitatem, cujus sequaces magna pars erant idiotæ et opifices, ut pistores, sutores, et id genus alii. Ait igitur Octavium esse quidem inter pistores Christianos præcipuum; at inter philosophos postremum.

[15] Chron. An. 1. Olymp. 145. (t. 8. p. 560.) Plautus.... qui propter annonæ difficultatem ad molas manuarias pistori se locaverat &c.

[16] Cont. Cels. l. 3. p. 144. (t. 1. p. 484 a. n. 55.) Ὁρῶμεν δὴ καὶ κατὰ

rustic fellows, who dare not speak a word before wise men, when they can get a company of children and silly women together, set up to teach strange paradoxes amongst them.' 'This is one of their rules,' says he again[17]; 'let no man that is learned, wise, or prudent, come among us; but if any be unlearned, or a child, or an idiot, let him freely come: so they openly declare, that none but fools and sots, and such as want sense, slaves, women, and children, are fit disciples for the God they worship[18].'

13. Nor was it only the heathens who thus reviled them; but commonly every perverse sect among the Christians had

Wit nam here

τὰς ἰδίας οἰκίας ἐρισυργοὺς, καὶ σκυτοτόμους, καὶ κναφεῖς, καὶ τοὺς ἀπαιδεύτους τε καὶ ἀγροικοτάτους, ἐναντίον μὲν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ φρονιμωτέρων δεσποτῶν οὐδὲν φθέγγεσθαι τολμῶντας· ἐπειδὰν δὲ τῶν παίδων ἰδίᾳ λάβωνται, καὶ γυναίων τινῶν σὺν αὐτοῖς ἀνοήτων, θαυμασιάττα διεξιόντας, κ. τ. λ.

[17] Ibid. (P. 475 f. n. 44.) .... *Τοιαῦτα ὑπ' αὐτῶν προστάσσεσθαι· μηδεὶς προσίτω πεπαιδευμένος, μηδεὶς σοφὸς, μηδεὶς φρόνιμος, (κακὰ γὰρ ταῦτα νομίζεται παρ' ἡμῖν) ἀλλ' εἴ τις ἀμαθὴς, εἴ τις ἀνόητος, εἴ τις ἀπαίδευτος, εἴ τις νήπιος, θαρρῶν ἡκέτω· τούτους γὰρ ἀξίους τοῦ σφετέρου Θεοῦ αὐτόθεν ὁμολογοῦντες, δῆλοί εἰσιν, ὅτι μόνους τοὺς ἠλιθίους καὶ ἀγενεῖς καὶ ἀναισθήτους καὶ ἀνδράποδα καὶ γύναια καὶ παιδάρια πείθειν ἐθέλουσί τε καὶ δύνανται.*

[18] [Augusti, Handbuch der Christlichen Archäologie, b. 2. c. 13. § 6. (v. 1. p. 124. Leipz. 1836.) sets down all these names under the head of *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα*, to which also he adds several like terms of reproach:—"In dieselbe Kategorie gehören auch die vielen Schimpf-Namen: *Creduli, Simplices, Stulti, Lucifugæ* (und *Lucifuga natio*), *Stupidi, Fatui, Rudes, Imperiti, Abjecti, Hebetes, Idiotæ, Rustici,* und viele andere, wovon man bez Kortholt ein stattliches Verzeichniss findet." He also notices the epithet *Cinerarii,* and refers to Bielke de Cinerariis in Selecta Schol. v. 1. p. 2.

In another section of the same chapter he dwells on some other terms, which the Heathen applied to the Christians; the spirit of which names of reproach the Apologists retorted on their assailants, viz. *Ἄθεοι,* (see § 3. p. 15. n. 74) *Novelli, Novissimi, Nuperrimi, Νεώτεροι,*—Ipsi nobiles, per quos superstitionis suæ originem antiquitatis assignant, nos *Novellos* dicentes. Ambros. Comm. in 1 Cor. 1, 26. Compare Prudent. Hymn. x. 14. 404. —Tertull. ad Nation. l. 1. c. 8. sub fin.—'Ridicula clementia, novissimos dicitis et tertios nominatis! *Σταυρολάτραι* and *Crucicolæ.* See Tertul. Apol. c. 16. Sed et qui crucis nos religiosos putat &c. and Minuc. Fel. Octav. c. xxix. Cruces etiam nec colimus nec optamus. [al. oramus. See Davies in loc.] *Οὐρανολάτραι* or *Cœlicolæ* and *Ἡλιολάτραι.* See Kortholt, Pagan. Obtrect. seu de Calumn. Gentil. in Vet. Christ. b. 3. pp. 286, 287.—Lubec. 1703–4. And lastly *Ὀνοχοηταὶ, libantes asino,* i. e. *sacerdotes asini,* or *asinarii.* See again Minuc. Fel. Octav. c. 28. (Dav. p. 143.) Inde est quod audire te dicis *caput asini rem nobis esse divinam.* Quis tam stultus ut hoc colat? &c. and particularly Tertull. Apol. c. 16. Nam, ut quidam, somniastis *caput asininum esse deum nostrum.* Hanc Cornelius Tacitus suspicionem ejusmodi inseruit. Is enim in quinta historiarum suarum, &c. See also Mamachius b. 1. c. 2. §§ 1—25. Rom. 1749. Ed.]

some reproachful name to cast upon them. The Novatian party called them *Cornelians*[19], because they communicated with Cornelius, bishop of Rome, rather than with Novatianus, his antagonist. They also termed them *Apostatics, Capitolins, Synedrians*[20], because they charitably decreed in their synods to receive apostates, and such as went to the Capitol to sacrifice, into their communion again, upon their sincere repentance. The Nestorians[21] termed the orthodox *Cyrillians;* and the Arians[22] called them *Eustathians* and *Paulinians*, from Eustathius and Paulinus, bishops of Antioch: as also *Homoousians*, because they kept to the doctrine of the ὁμοούσιον, which declared the Son of God to be of the same substance with the Father. The author of the Opus Imperfectum on St. Matthew, under the name of Chrysostom[23], styles them expressly *Hæresis Homoousianorum, the heresy of the Homoousians.* And so Serapion, in his conflict with Arnobius[24], calls them *Homoousianates*, which the printed copy reads corruptly *Homuncionates*, which was a name for the Nestorians.

14. The Cataphrygians or Montanists commonly called the Orthodox, ψυχικοὶ, *carnal;* because they rejected the prophecies and pretended inspirations of Montanus, and would not receive his rigid laws about fasting, nor abstain from second marriages, nor observe four lents in a year, &c. This was Tertullian's ordinary compliment to the Christians in all his books[25] written after he was fallen into the errors of Montanus.

[19] Eulog. ap. Phot., Cod. 280. (P. 1621. 48.) Καθαροὺς μὲν τοὺς, ὅσοι αὐτῷ ἐπλήρουν τὸ κατὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ὀνομάσας σύνταγμα. Κορνηλιανοὺς δὲ τοὺς τὴν αὐτοῦ βδελυξαμένους φιλαρχίαν, καὶ κατὰ τῶν μετανοούντων ἀπόνοιαν.

[20] Pacian. Ep. 2. ad Sempronian. (ap. Galland. t. 7. p. 260 a.) Apostaticum nomen habet, vel Capitolinum, &c.

[21] Ep. Legat. Schismat. ad suos in Epheso, in Act. 9. C. Ephes. (t. 3. p. 746 a.) . . . . Quod videntes Cyrillia nos, &c.

[22] Ap. Sozom. l. 6. c. 21. (v. 2. p. 243. 47.) Πλειόνων μὲν ὄντων τῶν τὰ Ἀρείου φρονούντων, καὶ τὰς ἐκκλησίας ἐχόντων· οὐκ ὀλίγων δὲ ὄντων καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς καθόλου ἐκκλησίας, οὓς Εὐσταθιανοὺς καὶ Παυλιανοὺς ὠνόμαζον.

[23] Op. Imperf. Hom. 48. (int. Oper. Chrysost. t. 6. p. 200 d.) Hæresis Homoousianorum non solum Christi Ecclesiæ adversatur, sed et omnibus hæresibus non similiter sapientibus.

[24] Confl. Arnob. et Serap. ad calc. Iren. (Paris. 1639. p. 519 d.) Serapion dixit: antequam ad hoc veniemus, quod vos Homuncionates arguamus, etc.

[25] Adv. Prax. c. 1. (p. 501 a.) Et nos quidem postea agnitio Paracleti atque defensio disjunxit a physicis.—Ibid. de Monogam. c. 1. (p. 525 c.) Hæretici nuptias auferunt, phy-

He calls his own party *the spiritual*, and the orthodox *the carnal;* and some of his books[26] are expressly entitled, *Adversus Psychicos.* Clemens Alexandrinus[27] observes, the same reproach was also used by other heretics beside the Montanists. And it appears from Irenæus, that this was an ancient calumny of the Valentinians, who styled themselves '*the spiritual* and *the perfect*, and the orthodox *the secular* and *carnal*[28], who had need of abstinence and good works, which were not necessary for them that were perfect.'

Allegorists, by the Millenaries.

15. The Millenaries styled them *Allegorists*, because they expounded the prophecy of the saints reigning a thousand years with Christ, Rev. xx. 4, to a mystical and allegorical sense. Whence Eusebius[29] observes of Nepos, the Egyptian bishop, who wrote for the Millennium, that he entitled his book Ἔλεγχος Ἀλληγοριστῶν, *a Confutation of the Allegorists.*

Chronitæ, by the Aëtians; *simplices*, by the Manichees; *anthropolatræ*, by the Apollinarians.

16. Aëtius, the Arian, gives them the abusive name of χρονῖται; by which he seems to intimate, that their religion was but temporary, and would shortly have an end: whereas the character was much more applicable to the Arians themselves, whose faith was so lately sprung up in the world; as the author of the Dialogues de Trinitate[30], under the name of Athanasius, who confutes Aëtius, justly retorts upon him.

The Manichees, as they gave themselves the most glorious names of *electi, macarii, catharistæ*, mentioned by St. Austin[31],

sici ingerunt; illi nec semel, isti non semel nubunt.—See also c. 11. Hæc physici volunt, etc.; and c. 16. . . . . Jam nec physicus, quia non de afflatu Dei physicus.

[26] De Jejuniis (p. 544.) De Pudicitia (p. 554.)

[27] Strom. l. 4. p. 511. (p. 604. 44.) Μὴ τοίνυν ψυχικοὺς ἐν ὀνείδους μέρει λεγόντων ἡμᾶς οἱ προειρημένοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ Φρύγες.

[28] L. 1. c. 11. (p. 29. 26.) Ἐπαιδεύθησαν τὰ ψυχικὰ οἱ ψυχικοὶ ἄνθρωποι, οἱ δὲ ἔργων καὶ πίστεως ψιλῆς βεβαιούμενοι, καὶ μὴ τὴν τελείαν γνῶσιν ἔχοντες· εἶναι δὲ τούτους ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡμᾶς λέγουσι· διὸ καὶ ἡμῖν μὲν ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι τὴν ἀγαθὴν πρᾶξιν ἀποφαίνοντα, [leg. ἀποφαίνοντας]· ἄλλως γὰρ ἀδύνατον σωθῆναι· αὐτοὺς δὲ μὴ διὰ πράξεως, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ φύσει πνευματικοὺς εἶναι, πάντῃ τε καὶ πάντως σωθήσεσθαι δογματίζουσιν.

[29] L. 7. c. 24. (v. 1. p. 349. 34.) Δόξας γοῦν οὗτος [Νέπως] ἐκ τῆς Ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰωάννου τὴν ἰδίαν κρατύνειν ὑπόληψιν, Ἔλεγχον. Ἀλληγοριστῶν, λόγον τινὰ περὶ τούτου συντάξας, ἐπέγραψε.

[30] Dial. 2. de Trin. t. 2. p. 193. (t. 2. p. 429 d. n. 11.) Τίνας δὲ λέγεις Χρονίτας; τοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων μέχρι καὶ σήμερον αἰνοῦντας Πατέρα καὶ Υἱὸν καὶ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα; ἢ τοὺς ἀπὸ σοῦ τοὺς χθὲς καὶ σήμερον φανέντας; κ. τ. λ.

[31] De Hær. c. 46. (t. 8. p. 14 c.) Nam his duabus professionibus, hoc est electorum et auditorum, ecclesiam suam constare voluerunt.—Ibid. (p. 15 d.) Quorum unus nomine Viator, eos qui ista faciunt, proprie catharistas vocari dicens, cum alias

so they reproached the Catholics with the most contemptible name of ***simplices, idiots;*** which is the term that Manichæus himself used in his dispute with Archelaus[32], the Mesopotamian bishop, styling the Christian teachers ***simpliciorum magistros, guides of the simple;*** because they could not relish his execrable doctrine concerning two principles of good and evil.

The Apollinarians were no less injurious to the Catholics, in fixing on them the odious name of ***anthropolatræ, man-worshippers;*** because they maintained that Christ was a perfect man, and had a reasonable soul and body, of the same nature with ours, which Apollinarius denied. Gregory Nazianzen[33] takes notice of this abuse, and sharply replies to it; telling the Apollinarians, 'that they themselves much better deserved the name of ***sarcolatræ, flesh-worshippers;*** for if Christ had no human soul, they must be concluded to worship his flesh only.'

hilosarcæ nd pelusi- s, &c., r the Ori- nians.

17. The Origenians, who denied the truth of the resurrection, and asserted that men should have only aërial and spiritual bodies in the next world, made jests upon the Catholics because they maintained the contrary; that our bodies should be the same individual bodies, and of the same nature that they are now, with flesh and bones, and all the members in the same form and structure, only altered in quality, not in substance. For this they gave them the opprobrious names of ***simplices*** and ***philosarcæ***[34], ***idiots*** and ***lovers of the flesh; carnei, animales, jumenta, carnal, sensual, animals; lutei, earthy; pelusiotes***[35], which is a term of the same importance, from the Greek word πηλὸς, ***lutum,*** as St. Jerom himself[36] explains it.

ejusdem Manichææ sectæ partes in Mattarios, et specialiter Manichæos, distribui perhiberet; etc.

[32] Ad calc. Sozom. (v. 2. p. 399. 41.) Ut ne indiscretos animos geras, sicut simpliciorum magistri docent, etc.

[33] Ep. 1. ad Cledon. [Orat. 51.] (t. 1. p. 742 c.) .... Σὺ μὲν διὰ τοῦτο ἀτιμάζεις, ὦ βέλτιστε, τὸν ἐμὸν νοῦν, ὡς σαρκολάτρης, εἴπερ ἀνθρωπολάτρης ἐγώ, κ. τ. λ.

[34] Hieron. Ep. 61. ad Pammach. [al. Lib. cont. Joan. Hierosol. c. 25.] (t. 2. p. 431 a.) Nos simplices et philosarcas dicere, quod eadem ossa, et sanquis, et caro, id est, vultus et membra, totiusque compago corporis resurgat in novissima die.

[35] Id. Ep. 65. ad Pammach. et Ocean. de Error. Orig. p. 192. (t. 2. p. 527 a.) Pelusiotas nos appellant, et luteos, animalesque et carneos, quod non recipiamus ea quæ spiritus sunt.

[36] Id. in Jerem. 29. p. 407. (t. 4. p. 1047 b.) Quæ cum audiunt discipuli ejus [Origenis] et Grunni-

So that though Baronius from some copies reads this name *pilosiotæ*, yet the true reading is *pelusiotæ*, as the passage cited in the margin plainly evinces.

18. But of all others the Luciferians gave the Church the rudest language, styling her *the brothel-house and synagogue of Antichrist and Satan;* because she allowed those bishops to retain their honour and places, who were cajoled by the Arians to subscribe the fraudulent confession of the Council of Ariminum. The Luciferian, in St. Jerom, runs out in this manner against the Church; and St. Jerom says[37], 'he spake but the sense of the whole party, for this was the ordinary style and language of all the rest.'

The synagogue of Antichrist and Satan by the Luciferians.

These are some of those reproachful names, which heretics, concurring with Jews and infidels, endeavoured to fasten upon the Christian Church; which I should not so much as have mentioned, but that they serve to give some light to antiquity, and therefore were not wholly to be passed over in a treatise of this nature.

CHAP. III.

Of the several orders of men in the Christian Church.

1. Having given an account of the several names of Christians, I proceed now to speak of the persons, and several orders of men in the Christian Church. Some divide them into three ranks, others into four, others into five; which yet come much to the same account, when they are compared together. Eusebius reckons but three orders, viz. the ἡγούμενοι, πιστοὶ, and κατηχούμενοι, *rulers, believers*, and *catechumens*. 'There are in every church,' says he[38], 'three orders of men, one of the rulers or guides, and two of those that are subject to them:

Three sorts of members of the Christian Church, the ἡγούμενοι, πιστοὶ, and κατηχούμενοι.

anæ familiæ stercora, putant se divina audire mysteria; nosque quod ista contemnimus, quasi pro brutis habent animantibus, et vocant πηλουσιώτας, [πιλωσιώτας, *Vallars.*] eo quod in luto istius corporis constituti non possimus sentire cœlestia.

[37] Dial. adv. Lucif. t. 2. p. 135. (t. 2. p. 171 a.) Asserebat universum mundum esse Diaboli: et, ut jam familiare est eis dicere, factum de Ecclesia lupanar..... Ac per hoc (Ibid. p. 172 b.) Antichristi magis Synagoga, quam Ecclesia Christi debeat nuncupari.

[38] Demonst. Evang. l. 7. c. 2. (p. 323 d.) ..... Τρία κατ' ἑκάστην ἐκκλησίαν τάγματα, ἓν μὲν τὸ τῶν ἡγουμένων, δύο δὲ τὰ τῶν ὑποβεβηκότων, τοῦ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ λαοῦ εἰς δύο τάγματα διῃρημένου, εἴς τε τὸ μὲν τῶν πιστῶν καὶ τῶν μὲν μεδέπω τῆς διὰ λοῦτρου παλιγγενεσίας ἠξιωμένων.

for the people are divided into two classes; the πιστοὶ, *believers*, and *the unbaptized*,' by whom he means *the catechumens*. St. Jerom[39] makes five orders; but then he divides the clergy into three orders to make up the number, reckoning them thus, '*bishops, presbyters, deacons, believers*, and *catechumens*.' In which account he follows Origen[40], who makes five degrees subordinate to one another in the Church; saying, 'Every one shall be punished according to the difference of his degree. If a bishop or president of the Church sins, he shall have the greater punishment. A catechumen will deserve mercy in comparison of a believer; and a layman in comparison of a deacon; and a deacon in comparison of a presbyter.' Here are plainly St. Jerom's five orders; first bishops, under the name of presidents of the Church; then presbyters; after them deacons; then believers, or laymen; and last of all, the catechumens.

lievers re strict- taken for laity it were ptized.

2. In all which accounts, these four things are proper to be remarked. 1st. That the name *believers*, πιστοὶ, and *fideles*, is here taken, in a more strict sense, only for one order of Christians, the believing or baptized laity, in contradistinction to the clergy and the catechumens, the two other orders of men in the Church. And in this sense the words πιστοὶ and *fideles* are commonly used in the ancient Liturgies[41] and Canons, to distinguish those that were baptized, and allowed to partake of the holy mysteries, from the catechumens; whence came that ancient distinction of the service of the Church into the *Missa Catechumenorum* and the *Missa Fidelium*[42]; of which more in its proper place.

[39] In Esai. 19. p. 64. (t. 4. p. 207 d.) ..... Quinque Ecclesiæ ordines, episcopos, presbyteros, diaconos, fideles, catechumenos.

[40] Hom. 5. in Ezek. (t. 3. p. 375 e.) .... Pro modo graduum unusquisque torquebitur. Majorem pœnam habet, qui ecclesiæ præsidet et delinquit. Annon magis misericordiam promeretur, ad comparationem fidelis, catechumenus? Non magis venia dignus est laicus, si ad diaconum conferatur? Rursum comparatione presbyteri diaconus veniam plus meretur.

[41] Vid. C. Nic. c. 11. (t. 2. p. 33 d.) Ὅσοι οὖν γνησίως μεταμέλονται, τρία ἔτη ἐν ἀκροωμένοις ποιήσουσιν οἱ πιστοὶ, καὶ ἑπτὰ ἔτη ὑποπεσοῦνται. —C. Eliber. c. 12. (t. 1. p. 972 a.) Mater, vel parens, vel quælibet fidelis, si lenocinium exercuerit, etc.—Ibid. c. 46. (p. 975 d.) Si quis fidelis apostata, per infinita tempora ad ecclesiam non accesserit, etc.—Ibid. c. 50. (p. 976 b.) Si vero quis clericus vel fidelis cum Judæis cibum sumserit, etc.—Const. Apost. l. 8. c. 34. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 415.) Πιστὸς μετὰ κατηχουμένου μήτε κατ' οἶκον προσευχέσθω.—Cyrill. Hierosol. Præf. Catech. n. 2. (p. 3 a.) Ἄφες, ἴδωμεν τί ποιοῦσιν οἱ πιστοί.

[42] C. Carth. iv. c. 84. (t. 2. p.

3. 2dly. We may hence observe, that the catechumens, though but imperfect Christians, were in some measure owned to be within the pale of the Church. Forasmuch as Eusebius, Origen, and St. Jerom reckon them one of the three orders of the Church; and the Councils of Eliberis[43] and Constantinople[44] give them expressly the name of *Christians;* though, as St. Austin[45] says, 'they were not yet sons, but servants: they belonged to the house of God, but were not yet admitted to all the privileges of it,' being only Christians at large, and not in the most strict and proper acceptation.

Catechumens owned as imperfect members of the Church.

4. And yet this is more than can be said of heretics, properly so called; for we may observe, 3dly, that in the forementioned division, heretics come into no account among Christians. They were not esteemed of, either as catechumens or believers, but as mere Jews or pagans; neither having the true faith, nor being willing to learn it. Tertullian[46] says, in general, 'if they be heretics, they cannot be Christians:' and St. Jerom[47], disputing with a Luciferian, says the same in express terms, 'that heretics are no Christians; nor to be spoken of but as we would do of heathens.' Lactantius[48] specifies in the Montanists, Novatians, Valentinians, Marcionites, Anthropians, Arians, saying, 'that they are no Christians who, forsaking the name of Christ, call themselves by other denominations.'

Heretics not reckoned among Christians.

1206 d.) Ut episcopus nullum prohibeat ingredi ecclesiam, et audire verbum Dei, sive gentilem, sive hæreticum, sive Judæum, usque ad missam catechumenorum.—C. Valent. Hisp. (t. 4. p. 1617 e.) Quatenus salutaria præcepti Domini nostri Jesu Christi, vel sermonem sacerdotis, non solum fideles, sed etiam catechumeni, ac pœnitentes, et omnes qui ex diverso sunt, audire licitum habeant.

[43] C. 39. (t. 1. p. 975 a.) Gentiles, si in infirmitate desideraverint sibi manum imponi, si fuerit eorum ex aliqua parte vita honesta, placuit eis manum imponi et fieri Christianos.

[44] Constant. 1. c. 7. (t. 2. p. 951 c.) Καὶ τὴν πρώτην ἡμέραν ποιοῦμεν αὐτοὺς Χριστιανοὺς, τὴν δὲ δευτέραν κατηχουμένους· εἶτα τὴν τρίτην ἐξορκίζομεν αὐτοὺς, κ. τ. λ.

[45] Tract. 11. in Joan. t. 9. p. 41. (t. 3. part. 2. p. 376 g.) Quod signum crucis in fronte habent catechumeni, jam de domo magna sunt; sed fiant ex servis filii. Non enim nihil sunt, quia ad domum magnam pertinent.

[46] De Præscript. c. 37. (p. 215 c.) Si enim hæretici sunt, Christiani esse non possunt.

[47] Dial. cont. Lucif. t. 2. p. 135. (t. 2. p. 171 c.) Hæretici Christiani non sunt.... Igitur præfixum inter nos habemus, de hæretico sic loquendum sicut de gentili.

[48] Instit. l. 4. c. 30. (t. 1. p. 353.) Cum enim Phryges, aut Novatiani, aut Valentiniani, aut Marcionitæ, aut Anthropiani, aut Ariani, seu quilibet alii nominantur, Christiani esse desierunt, qui Christi nomine omisso, humana et externa vocabula induerunt.

Athanasius[49] and Hilary[50] say the same of the Arians, 'that they are not Christians.' Constantine[51], therefore, enacted it into a law, that they should not be called Christians, but Porphyrians, from Porphyry, that infamous heathen, whose practice they so much resembled in their impious blasphemies and reproaches of Christ and the Christian religion. And in imitation of this, Theodosius Junior[52] made another law to the same effect against Nestorius and his followers, 'that they should not abuse the name of Christians, but be called *Simonians*, from Simon Magus, the arch-heretic;' to which we may add that decree of the general Council of Sardica, in their Synodical Epistle[53] against the Arians, where they require all Catholics not only to deny the Arian bishops the title of bishops, but even that of Christians. All which evidently proves, that the ancients put a manifest difference betwixt those who were apostates from the faith, and those who as yet had never made any solemn profession of their faith in baptism. They allowed the catechumens the name of Christians, because they were candidates of heaven; but they judged heretics unworthy of that name, because they corrupted the common faith of Christians, and denied the Lord, by whose name they were called.

itents ener- ıens ked in same s with ıchu- ıs.

5. 4thly. We may observe, in the last place, that there were no Christians but what might be reduced to some one or other of the three fore-mentioned orders; for the penitents, and energumens, as they called those that were possessed with evil spirits, may be ranked among the catechumens, being commonly treated and disciplined by the Church in the same manner as

[49] Orat. 2. [al. Orat. 1.] adv. Arian. t. 1. p. 316. (t. 1. part. 1. p. 327 c.)... Ἀρειανοὶ ὄντες, οὐκ εἰσὶ Χριστιανοί.

[50] Ad Constant. l. 1. p. 98. (t. 2. p. 536 a. 7.) .... Christianus sum, non Arianus.

[51] Ep. ad Episc. ap. Socrat. l. 1. c. 9. (v. 2. p. 31. 35.) ..... Ἔδοξεν Ἀρειόν τε καὶ τοὺς Ἀρείου ὁμογνώμενους Πορφυριανοὺς μὲν καλεῖσθαι, ἵν' ὧν τοὺς πρόπους μεμίμηνται, τούτων ἔχωσι καὶ τὴν προσηγορίαν.

[52] Vid. Cod. Theod. l. 16. tit. 5. de Hæret. c. 66. (t. 6. p. 190.) Damnato portentosæ superstitionis auctore Nestorio, nota congrui nominis ejus inuratur gregalibus, ne Christianorum appellatione abutantur; sed quemadmodum Ariani lege divæ memoriæ Constantini ob similitudinem impietatis *Porphyriani* a Porphyrio nuncupantur; sic ubique participes nefariæ sectæ Nestorii Simoniani vocentur.—See the same in the Acts of the general Council of Ephesus, part. 3. c. 45. (t. 3. p. 1209 a.) Cum ergo Nestorius, etc.

[53] Ap. Theodor. l. 2. c. 8. (v. 3. p. 79. 31.) Τοὺς δὲ εἰς τὰς ἐκκλησίας αὐτῶν ἐπελθόντας δίκην λύκων, Γρηγόριον τὸν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ, Βασίλειον τὸν ἐν Ἀγκύρᾳ, καὶ Κυντιανὸν τὸν ἐν Γάζῃ, τούτους μηδὲ ἐπισκόπους ὀνομάζειν μηδὲ Χριστιανούς, κ. τ. λ.

they were, and placed in the same class with them; and the monks and other ascetics may be ranked under the common head of believers, though they had some peculiar marks of distinction in the Church. Yet I shall not confine myself to speak of all those precisely in this order, and under these heads, but give each a distinct and proper place in this discourse; speaking here only of believers in general, as they stood distinguished from the catechumens and the clergy of the Church, and treating of the rest as occasion shall require in the following parts of this discourse.

CHAP. IV.

A more particular account of the πιστοὶ, or believers. Their titles of honour and privileges above the catechumens.

1. THE πιστοὶ, or *fideles*, being such as were baptized, and thereby made complete and perfect Christians, were, upon that account, dignified with several titles of honour and marks of distinction above the catechumens. They were hence called φωτιζόμενοι, *the illuminate;* so the Council of Laodicea[54] terms those that were newly baptized, προσφάτως φωτισθέντας; and Jobius, in Photius[55], οἱ φωτιζόμενοι: as St. Paul himself, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, twice uses the word *illuminate* for baptized, in the opinion of most[56] interpreters. The reason of the name is given by Justin Martyr, who says[57], 'they were so called because their understandings were enlightened by the knowledge that was consequent to baptism:' for all the mysteries of religion were unveiled to the baptized, which were kept secret from the catechumens; and sometimes, also, baptism was attended with extraordinary illuminations of the Holy Ghost,

Belie other called τιζόμ the il nate.

[54] C. 3. (t. 1. p. 1496 c.) Περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν πρόσφατον φωτισθέντας προσάγεσθαι ἐν τάγματι ἱερατικῷ.

[55] Cod. 222. (p. 596. 35.) Οἱ φωτιζόμενοι ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας λαμποφοροῦσιν. Vid. ibid. p. 597. 20.

[56] Grot. ad Hebr. 6. 4. (t. 2. v. 2. p. 1028. 2.) Verum quidem est, baptismum apud veteres nomen habuisse φωτισμοῦ, illuminationis, etc.— Estius, ad h. l. (p. 951.) .... *Illuminatos* sine dubio vocat [Apostolus] baptizatos; .. Vocabatur baptismus, antiquis Ecclesiæ temporibus, *sacramentum illuminationis*, sive ut Græci loquuntur, *illuminationum*, φωτισμάτων, etc.— Conf. ibid. in Hebr. 10. 32. (p. 1028.) Breviter, *illuminati*, id est, *baptizati*, etc.

[57] Apol. 2. (p. 94 d.) ... Καλεῖται δὲ τοῦτο τὸ λοῦτρον φωτισμὸς, ὡς φωτιζομένων τὴν διάνοιαν τῶν ταῦτα μανθανόντων.

as in those whom St. Paul caused to be baptized at Ephesus— Acts xix. 6. "They spake with tongues, and prophesied."

l *οἱ μεμυημένοι, initi-*

2. They were hence also styled *οἱ μεμυημένοι*, which the Latins call *initiati, the initiated*, that is, admitted to the use of the sacred offices, and knowledge of the sacred mysteries of the Christian religion. Hence came that form of speaking, so frequently used by St. Chrysostom and other ancient writers[58], when they touched upon any doctrines or mysteries which the catechumens understood not, *ἴσασιν οἱ μεμυημένοι, the initiated know what is spoken.* St. Ambrose writes a book to these *initiati*[59]. Isidore of Pelusium[60], and Hesychius[61], call them *μύσται*, and others *μυσταγώγητοι*; whence the catechumens have the contrary names, *ἄμυστοι, ἀμύητοι*, and *ἀμυσταγώγητοι, the uninitiated* or *unbaptized.*

l *τέ-, the fect.*

3. Believers were otherwise called *τέλειοι*, and *τελειούμενοι, the perfect*, because they were consummate Christians, who had a right to participate of the holy eucharist, the *τὸ τέλειον*, as it is frequently called in the canons of the ancient Councils[62], where *ἐπὶ τὸ τέλειον ἐλθεῖν*, and *τοῦ τελειοῦ μετέχειν*, always signify, *participation of the holy eucharist*, that sacred mystery that unites us to Christ, and gives us the most consummate perfection that we are capable of in this world.

ari Dei, Dei, n, &c.

4. Tertullian[63] adds to these the name of *chari Dei, the favourites of Heaven*, because their prayers and intercessions were powerful with God to obtain pardon for others, that should address heaven by them. Therefore, in his instructions to the penitents, he bids them, *charis Dei adgenicu-*

[58] Casaub. Exercit. 16. n. 43. in Baron. (p. 399. col. 2.) observes this phrase to occur no less than fifty times in St. Chrysostom and St. Austin. Quis ita hospes in Patrum lectione, cui sit ignota formula, etc.

[59] De his, qui initiantur mysteriis. (t. 2. pp. 325, seqq.)

[60] L. 4. Ep. 162. (p. 504 e.) . . Ἴσασιν οἱ μύσται τὸ λεγόμενον.

[61] In voce, Μύσται.

[62] C. Ancyr. c. 4. (t. 1. p. 1457 c.) Ἔδοξεν ἐνιαυτὸν ἀκροᾶσθαι, ὑποπεσεῖν δὲ τρία ἔτη, εὐχῆς δὲ μόνης κοινωνῆσαι ἔτη δύο, καὶ τότε ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ τὸ τέλειον.—Ibid. c. 5. (t. 1. p. 1457 d.) Ἵνα τὸ τέλειον τῇ τετραετίᾳ [al. τριετίᾳ] ἐλάβωσι [al. λάβωσι].—Ibid. c. 6. (p. 1460 a.) Ἔδοξε μέχρι τῆς μεγάλης ἡμέρας εἰς ἀκρόασιν δεχθῆναι, καὶ μετὰ τὴν μεγάλην ἡμέραν ὑποπεσεῖν τρία ἔτη, κ. τ. λ.

[63] De Pœnit. c. 9. (p. 127 a.) Plerumque vero jejuniis preces alere, ingemiscere, lacrymari, mugire dies noctesque ad Dominum Deum suum [tuum, *Semler.*] presbyteris advolvi, et caris Dei adgeniculari, omnibus fratribus legationes deprecationis suæ injungere. [*Semler* also reads *aris Dei*, which quite alters the sense, and does not seem to agree with the context. Ed.]

lari, 'fall down at the feet of those favourites, and commend their suit to all the brethren, desiring them to intercede with God for them.'

All these names[64], and many others that might be added, which are obvious to every reader, such as *saints*, and *sons of God, &c.*, were peculiar titles of honour and respect, given only to those who were πιστοὶ, or *believers*.

5. 1. And hence it was, that, correspondent to these names, the *fideles* had their peculiar privileges in the Church, above the catechumens. For, first, it was their sole prerogative to partake of the Lord's table, and communicate with one another in the symbols of Christ's body and blood at the altar. Hither none came but such as were first initiated by baptism: whence the custom was, before they went to celebrate the eucharist, for a deacon to proclaim, Ἅγια ἁγίοις, *Holy things for holy men!* 'Ye catechumens, go forth,' as the author of the Constitutions,[65] and St. Chrysostom, and some others word it.

The lege *fidel* 1. T take euch

6. 2. Another of their prerogatives above catechumens, was, to stay and join with the minister in all the prayers of the Church, which the catechumens were not allowed to do: for in the ancient service of the Church, there were no prayers preceding the communion-office; but only such as particularly related either to the several classes of penitents or the *energumeni*, that is, *persons possessed with evil spirits*, or the catechumens themselves. When these prayers were ended, the catechumens, and all others, were commanded to withdraw; and then began the communion-service at the altar, where none were admitted so much as to be spectators, save those who were to communicate in the eucharist: for to join in prayers and participation of the eucharist were then privileges of the same persons; and no one was qualified for the prayers of the Church who was not qualified for the communion.

2. T in a pray the

[64] [See Mamachius, c. 1. De honorificis nominibus, quibus olim sese vocare Christiani solebant. s. 9. (v. 1. pp. 65–69.) Ed.]

[65] L. 8. c. 8. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 395.) Καὶ λεγέτω ὁ διάκονος, Προέλθετε οἱ φωτιζόμενοι. — Ibid. c. 12. (p. 398.) Μήτις κατηχουμένων· μήτις ἀκροωμένων· μήτις τῶν ἀπίστων.— Chrysost. Hom. in Parab. de Fil. Prod. t. 6. p. 314. (t. 8. int. Spur. append. p. 36 b.) Ἔασόν με στῆναι μετὰ τῶν κατηχουμένων, τῶν θυρῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἔνδον· ἵνα θεωρῶν τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ τελούμενα μυστήρια, ποθήσω κατὰ μικρὸν ταῦτα πάλιν ἀναλαβεῖν. —Ibid. (p. 37 a.) Μήτις κατηχουμένων, μήτις τῶν μὴ ἐσθιόντων, κ.τ.λ.

3. The use of the Lord's Prayer, another prerogative of the πιστοί; whence it was called εὐχὴ πιστῶν, *the prayer of believers.*

7. 3. More particularly the use of the Lord's Prayer was the sole prerogative of the πιστοὶ, or *believers;* for then it was no crime, or argument of weakness, or want of the Spirit, to use it: but an honour and privilege of the most consummate and perfect Christians. The catechumens were not allowed to say, 'Our Father,' till they had first made themselves sons by regeneration in the waters of baptism. This is expressly said by St. Chrysostom[66], St. Austin[67], Theodoret[68], and several others: and for this reason Chrysostom[69] calls it εὐχὴ πιστῶν: and St. Austin[70], *oratio fidelium, the prayer of the regenerate,* or *believers;* because it was their privilege and birthright. 'It was given to them as their property,' he says[70], 'and therefore they made use of it, having a right to say, "Our Father, which art in heaven," who were born again to such a Father, by water and the Holy Ghost.'

4. They were admitted to hear discourses upon the most profound mysteries of religion.

8. 4. Lastly, they were admitted to be auditors of all discourses made in the Church, even those that treated of the most abstruse points and profound mysteries of the Christian religion: which the catechumens were strictly prohibited from hearing. The catechumens were allowed to hear the Scriptures, and the ordinary popular discourses that were made upon them: which was no more than what some Councils[71]

[66] Hom. 2. in 2 Cor. p. 740. (t. 10. p. 435 c.) Οὐδέπω εὐχὴν ἔχουσι τὴν νενομισμένην, καὶ εἰσενεχθεῖσαν ὑπὸ Χριστοῦ, οὐδέπω παρρησίαν κέκτηνται, ἀλλ' ἑτέρων δέονται τῶν μυσταγωγηθέντων.

[67] Hom. 29. de Verb. Apost. [al. Serm. 181. c. 5.] (t. 5. p. 868 g.) Interrogo te ..... oratio ista ecclesiæ est, fidelium est, an catechumenorum? Certe utique regeneratorum est, id est, baptizatorum, etc.

[68] Divers. Dogmat. c. 28. as cited by Suicer, in voce, Εὐχή. (t. 1. p. 1284.) Ταύτην τὴν προσευχὴν οὐ τοὺς ἀμυήτους, ἀλλὰ τοὺς μυσταγωγουμένους διδάσκομεν· οὐδεὶς γὰρ τῶν ἀμυήτων λέγειν τολμᾷ, Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, μήπω δεξάμενος τῆς υἱοθεσίας τὸ χάρισμα. Ὁ δὲ τῆς τοῦ βαπτίσματος τετυχηκὼς λουτρᾶς Πατέρα καλεῖ τὸν Θεὸν, ὡς υἱοὺς τελέσας τῆς χάριτος. Oper. Theodor. Hæret. Fab. l. 5. c. 28. (t. 4. part. 1. p. 479.) where the words are the same. Ed.]

[69] Hom. 10. in Col. p. 1385. (t. 11. p. 399 b.) Εἶτα ἐπιθεὶς τὴν εὐχὴν τῶν πιστῶν, ἐνταῦθα ἐπαύετο, ὡς κορωνίδα τινὰ καὶ σύνδεσμον ὑπὲρ πάντων τὴν εὐχὴν ποιησάμενος.

[70] Enarrat. in Ps. 142. (t. 4. p. 1593 a.) Orabant autem utique jam fideles, utique jam apostoli: nam ista Oratio Dominica magis fidelibus datur.—It. Enchir. c. 71. (t. 6. p. 223 b.) De quotidianis autem brevibus, levibusque peccatis, sine quibus hæc vita non ducitur, quotidiana fidelium oratio satisfacit. Eorum est enim dicere 'Pater noster, qui es in cœlis,' qui jam Patri tali regenerati sunt ex aqua et Spiritu.

[71] C. Carth. 4. c. 84. See before, c. 3. s. 2. p. 28. n. 42.

llow even to Jews and Gentiles: for in those discourses they ever treated plainly of their mysteries, but in such a covert ray as the catechumens could not understand them. But hen the catechumens were dismissed, then they discoursed ore openly of their mysteries before the *fideles*, whose prilege it was to be the sole auditors of such discourses. This e learn from St. Ambrose[72], who says, 'his common discourses the unbaptized were only upon points of morality; but hen they were baptized, then was the time to open to them he mysteries and sacraments of religion: to have discoursed them of those things before, had been more like exposing ysteries than explaining them.' St. Austin speaks to the ame purpose in one of his sermons[73] to the newly-baptized. Having now dismissed the catechumens,' says he, 'we have etained you only to be our hearers; because, beside those hings which belong to all Christians in common, we are now discourse more particularly of the heavenly mysteries, or acraments; which none are qualified to hear but such as, by od's gift, are made partakers of them. And, therefore, ye ught to hear them with the greater reverence, by how much ore sublime those doctrines are, which are committed only to he baptized and believing auditors, than those which the atechumens also are wont to hear.' Theodoret takes notice f the same distinction made in their discourses, according to he difference of their auditors; saying[74], 'We discourse ob-

[72] De his qui mysteriis initiantur, 1.(t. 2. p. 325 b.) De moralibus quodianum sermonem habuimus. Cum el Patriarcharum gesta, vel Proveriorum legerentur præcepta: ut his formati atque instituti adsuescere- s majorum ingredi vias, eorumque er carpere, ac divinis obedire oralis: quo renovati per baptismum, us vitæ usum teneretis, quæ abluis deceret. Nunc de mysteriis icere tempus admonet, atque ipsam acramentorum rationem edere, uam ante baptismum si putasseus insinuandam nondum initiatis, rodidisse potius quam edidisse stimaremur.

[73] Serm. 1. ad Neophyt. in apend. t. 10. p. 845. [De eo, quod eophytis ex oleo sancto, &c.] (t. 6. pend. p. 288 d.) Ideo enim dimissis jam catechumenis, vos tantum ad audiendum retinuimus; quia præter illa, quæ omnes Christianos convenit in commune servare, specialiter de cœlestibus mysteriis locuturi sumus, quæ audire non possunt, nisi qui ea, donante jam Domino, perceperunt. Tanto ergo majore reverentia debetis audire quæ dicimus, quanto majora ista sunt, quæ solis baptizatis et fidelibus auditoribus committuntur; quam illa quæ etiam catechumeni audire consueverunt.

[74] Quæst. 15. in Num. (t. 1. part. 1. p. 230.).... Ἀσήμως γὰρ διὰ τοὺς ἀμύητους περὶ τῶν θείων διαλεγόμεθα μυστηρίων· τούτων δὲ χωριζομένων, σαφῶς τοὺς μεμυημένους διδάσκομεν.

securely of divine mysteries before the unbaptized; but when they are departed, we speak plainly to the baptized.' From all which it is evident, that the *fideles* were singled out as the only proper auditors fit to hear discourses upon the sublime doctrines and mysteries of religion; and in these, and the like privileges, consisted their prerogative above the catechumens.

CHAP. V.

Of the distinction betwixt the Laity and Clergy, and of the antiquity of that distinction.

1. We have hitherto considered the great body of the Christian Church, the *fideles*, as opposed to the catechumens. We are now to view them in another relation, as contradistinct to the clergy; in which relation they went by other names, such as those of *laici*, *laymen*; βιωτικοὶ, *seculars*; ἰδιῶται, *private men*. The most common and ancient name was that of *laici*, which every where occurs in the writings of Origen, Cyprian, and Tertullian, and others of the third century; which is a thing so evident, that the greatest enemies of this distinction, Rigaltius,[75] Salmasius, and Selden, do not pretend to dispute it; but only say, there was originally no such distinction in the Church: but that it is a novelty, and owing to the ambition of the clergy of the third century, in which Cyprian and Tertullian lived.

2. This accusation reflects highly upon St. Cyprian, and other holy martyrs, his contemporaries, who were as far from the ambition that is charged upon them, as the authors are from truth, who bring the charge. For, indeed, the distinction was none of their inventing; but derived from the Jewish Church, and adopted into the Christian by the Apostles themselves. Clemens Alexandrinus,[76] speaking of St. John, says,

[75] In Cypr. Ep. 2. [al. 8.] In verba inscriptionis, Cleri Romani vel Clerum Carthaginiensem, &c. (Prior. p. 7. n. a.) [Consult the entire note, and particularly the latter part of it. —Sed vix alterius sæculi disciplina fuit, cum ipsi pastores nomen cleri, quod erat ovium universitati commune, sic proprium sibi fecerint, ut jam nomen ipsum ovilis in populi sive plebis et laicorum appellatione vilesceret. Hinc exorta jam ævo Tertulliani ac Cypriani inter clericos et laicos differentia tanta, ut laici non intelligerentur appellatione cleri, &c. Ed.]

[76] Quis dives salvetur? ap. Combefis. Auct. Noviss. part. 1. p. 185 a. 5. (int. Oper. Clem. Ed. Oxon. p. 959. 2.) Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τοῦ τυράννου

'that after his return from banishment in the isle of Patmos, he settled at Ephesus; whence being often invited to visit the neighbouring regions, he ordained them bishops and set apart such men for the clergy, as were signified to him by the Holy Ghost.' Whence it appears, that the name κλῆρος, *clergy*, was always a peculiar title of those that were set apart for the ministry and service of God. And that this distinction came from the Jewish Church, is evident from what Clemens Romanus[77] says of the Jewish economy; 'that as the high priest had his office assigned him, and the priests also their proper station, and the Levites their peculiar service; so laymen, in like manner, were under the obligation of precepts proper for laymen.' These instances evidently prove that a distinction was always observed in these names, *laity* and *clergy*, from the first foundation of the Christian Church[78].

3. There is but one objection of any moment against this, An objection

τελευτήσαντος, ἀπὸ τῆς Πάτμου τῆς νήσου μετῆλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν Ἔφεσον, ἀπῆει παρακαλούμενος καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ πλησιόχωρα τῶν ἐθνῶν, ὅπου μὲν ἐπισκόπους καταστήσων, ὅπου δὲ ὅλας ἐκκλησίας ἁρμόσων, ὅπου δὲ κλῆρον, ἵνα τέ τινα κληρώσων ὑπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος σημαινομένων. Conf. Euseb. l. 3. c. 23. (v. 1. p. 113. 1.)

[77] Ep. 1 ad Cor. n. 40. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 169.) Τῷ γὰρ ἀρχιερεῖ ἰδίαι λειτουργίαι δεδομέναι εἰσὶ, καὶ τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν ἴδιος ὁ τόπος προστέτακται, καὶ λευῖταις ἰδίαι διακονίαι ἐπίκεινται· ὁ λαϊκὸς ἄνθρωπος τοῖς λαϊκοῖς προστάγμασιν δέδεται. [Cum tam pauca sint Hellenistarum Judæorum scripta, quæ ad nos pervenerunt, mirum non est, loca proferri non posse, e quibus liqueat sacerdotes et Levitas dictos κλῆρον et κληρικούς: ..... Hinc credibile est vocem λαϊκὸς usitatam apud Hellenistas Judæos, ut significaretur a tribu Levis, aut etiam prosapia Aharonis alienus. Quibus verisimile fit, jam a primævis scriptoribus Christianorum, qui Judæorum Hellenistarum sermonem imitati sunt, vocem λαϊκὸς adhibitam esse ad significandum eum, qui sacro nullo ministerio fungebatur, et vocibus etiam κλῆρος et κληρικὸς ut designentur ii, qui sacris operam dabant. Le Clerc, as cited by Jacobson in loc. Patr. Apost. Oxon. 1838. 2 vol. 8vo. Ed.]

[78] Dodwel. Dissert. 1. in Cypr. De voce Cleri, s. 9. (append. p. 4.) Ut autem verum fateor κλήρων nomine ego non *personas* sed *hæreditates* potius ecclesiæ dicatas intelligo, &c. [Vox *hominis laici* in oppositione ad hominem ecclesiasticum seu clericum forsitan hic prima vice occurrit; refertur autem in isto loco ad Judæos non Christianos, significatque illos qui in Ecclesia Judaica nec summo pontificatu, nec sacerdotio, nec ullo alio munere sacro perfungebantur; quemadmodum in V. T. frequenter עם aut עם הקהל opponitur τοῖς κοῖνοις ut Lev. xvi. 33. Transiit postea hujus vocis a Judaica in Christianam Ecclesiam, unde toties apud secundi et tertii sæculi Patres, Clementem Alex., Origenem, Tertullianum et Cyprianum occurrit. Rem ipsam, i. e. distinctionem inter ordinem clericorum et laicorum, tempore jam Apostolico obtinuisse, scripta Apostolorum abunde docent; an jam istis nominibus eo tempore fuerit expressa in disceptione versatur, etc.—Frey, as cited by Jacobson, ibid. Ed.]

Pet. which is taken from the words of St. Peter, 1 Ep. v. 3, where he bids the elders of the Church "not lord it over God's heritage." The original is, μηδ' ὡς κατακυριεύοντες τῶν κλήρων, which, as some learned critics observe, may as well signify the possessions of the Church, as the people. But admit that it means the people; this is no more than is said of the people of Israel, who are called God's κλῆρος, and λαὸς ἔγκληρος, *his inheritance*, or *his clergy*, (Deut. iv. 20, ix. 29.) as both the Jews and Christians were, in opposition to the heathen; notwithstanding which, God had his peculiar κλῆρος among his own people, who were his lot or inheritance, and distinguished by that name from the *laici*, or remaining body of the people. As we have observed before, in the name πιστοὶ, *fideles*, or *believers*, all persons within the pale of the Church were called *believers*, in opposition to infidels and pagans; but when they would distinguish one order of men in the Church from another, then the name, *believers*, was given peculiarly to such as were baptized, and the rest were called *catechumens*; so here, all Christian people are called God's κλῆρος, *his lot, his inheritance*, or *his clergy*; but when his ministers are to be distinguished from the rest of the people in the Church, then the name *clerici*, or *clergy* was their appropriate title, and the name of the other *laymen*.

4. And this observation will help to set another sort of persons right, who confound not only the names, but the offices of laity and clergy together; and plead that originally there was no distinction between them. The name of priesthood, indeed, is sometimes given in common to the whole body of Christian people, 1 Pet. ii. 9. Rev. i. 6.; but so it was to the Jewish people, Exod. xix. 6., "Ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation." Yet every one knows, that the offices of the priests and Levites, among the Jews, were very distinct from those of the common people, not by usurpation, but by God's appointment; and so it was among Christians, from the first foundation of the Church. Wherever any number of converts were made, as soon as they were capable of being formed into an organical church, a bishop, or a presbyter, with a deacon, was ordained to minister to them, as Epiphanius[79]

[79] Hær. 75. Aërian. (t. 1. p. 908 c.) Ὅπου μὲν ἦσαν ἐπίσκοποι ἤδη κατασταθέντες, ἔγραφεν [ὁ ἅγιος ἀπόστολος] ἐπισκόποις καὶ διακόνοις. οὐ γὰρ

delivers from the ancient histories of the Church. The same may be observed in the forementioned passage of Clemens Alexandrinus, where he says, 'St. John ordained bishops and other clergy, in the churches which he regulated, by the direction of the Holy Ghost.' Hence it is that Ignatius so frequently in all his Epistles[80] charges the people to do nothing without the bishops, presbyters, and deacons. Tertullian[81] says, it was customary among heretics to confound the offices of clergy and laity together; 'they made one a bishop to-day, and another to-morrow; to-day a deacon, and to-morrow a reader; to-day a presbyter, and to-morrow a layman: for laymen among them performed the offices of the priesthood.' But this was not the custom of the catholic Church: for, as St. Jerom[82] observes, 'they reckoned that to be no church, which had no priests; they were of no esteem with them, who were both laymen and bishops together.' And by this we may judge how ingenuously they deal with St. Jerom and Tertullian, who allege their authorities to prove, that every Christian is as much a priest as another. St. Jerom[83], indeed,

πάντα εὐθὺς ἠδυνήθησαν οἱ ἀπόστολοι καταστῆσαι. Πρεσβυτέρων γὰρ ἐγίνετο χρεία καὶ διακόνων. διὰ γὰρ τῶν δύο τούτων τὰ ἐκκλησιαστικὰ δύνανται πληροῦσθαι. Ὅπου δὲ οὐχ εὑρέθη τις ἄξιος ἐπισκοπῆς, ἔμεινεν ὁ τόπος χωρὶς ἐπισκόπου. ὅπου δὲ γέγονε χρεία, καὶ ἦσαν ἄξιοι ἐπισκοπῆς, κατεστάθησαν ἐπίσκοποι. Πλήθους δὲ μὴ ὄντος, οὐχ εὑρέθησαν ἐν αὐτοῖς πρεσβύτεροι κατασταθῆναι, καὶ ἠρκέσθησαν ἐπὶ τῷ κατὰ τόπον μόνῳ ἐπισκόπῳ. ἄνευ δὲ διακόνου, ἐπίσκοπον ἀδύνατον εἶναι. καὶ ἐπιμελήσατο ὁ ἅγιος ἀπόστολος διακόνους εἶναι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ διὰ τὴν ὑπηρεσίαν, οὕτω τῆς ἐκκλησίας λαβούσης τὰ πληρώματα τῆς οἰκονομίας.

[80] Ep. ad Magnes. n. 6. (Cotel. v. 2. p. 57.) Παραινῶ ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ Θεοῦ σπουδάζετε πάντα πράσσειν, προκαθημένου τοῦ ἐπισκόπου εἰς τόπον Θεοῦ, καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων εἰς τόπον συνεδρίου τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ τῶν διακόνων, τῶν ἐμοὶ γλυκυτάτων, πεπιστευμένων διακονίαν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.—Ibid. n. 7. (p. 58.) Ὥσπερ οὖν ὁ Κύριος ἄνευ τοῦ Πατρὸς οὐδὲν ἐποίησε ἡνωμένος ὤν, οὔτε δι' ἑαυτοῦ, οὔτε διὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων, οὕτως μηδὲ ὑμεῖς ἄνευ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, μηδὲν πράσσετε, κ. τ. λ. [Οὐδὲν ποιεῖ· οὐ δύναμαι γάρ, φησι, ποιεῖν ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ οὐδέν, is the reading in Cotelerius, omitting the clause ἡνωμένος ὤν, κ. τ. λ. Vid. not. ad locum. Ed.] —Vid. Ep. ad Trall. n. 2. (p. 63.) Ἀναγκαῖον οὖν ἐστι, ὅσαπερ [al. ὥσπερ] ποιεῖτε, ἄνευ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου μηδὲν πράσσειν ὑμᾶς, κ. τ. λ.—It. Ep. ad Philadelph. n. 7. (p. 83.) Τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ προσέχετε, καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ, καὶ διακόνοις .... χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου μηδὲν ποιεῖτε, κ. τ. λ.

[81] De Præscript. c. 41. (p. 217 c.) Itaque alius hodie episcopus, cras alius; hodie diaconus, qui cras lector; hodie presbyter, qui cras laicus; nam et laicis sacerdotalia munera injungunt.

[82] Dial. cont. Lucif. t. 2. p. 145. (t. 2. p. 194 d.) Ecclesia autem non est, quæ non habet sacerdotes. Sed omissis paucis homunculis, qui ipsi [sibi] et laici sunt et episcopi.

[83] Ibid. p. 136. (p. 174 a.) Sacerdotium laici, id est, baptisma .... Scriptum est enim, regnum et sacerdotes nos fecit, etc.

says, 'there is a laical priesthood;' but then he explains himself to mean no more by that, than Christian baptism, whereby we are made kings and priests to God. And Tertullian[84] grants no other priesthood to laymen, save that they may baptize in case of absolute necessity, when none of the ecclesiastical order can be had; which was according to the principles and practice of the primitive Church; but does by no means confound the offices of laity and clergy together, unless any one can think cases ordinary and extraordinary all one. The ancient historians, Socrates[85] and Ruffin[86], tell us, that Frumentius and Ædesius, two young men, who had no external call or commission to preach the Gospel, being carried captive into India, converted the nation, and settled several churches among them. And the same Socrates[87] and Theodoret[88] say, that the Iberians were first converted by a captive woman, who made the king and queen of the nation preachers of the Gospel to their people. Yet a man would argue very weakly, that should hence conclude, that therefore there was no distinction betwixt clergy and laity in the primitive Church; or that laymen might preach without a call, and women ordain ministers of the Gospel. The author of the Comments upon St. Paul's Epistles, under the name of St. Ambrose[89], seems to say indeed, that at first 'all Christ's disciples were clergy, and had all a general commission to preach the Gospel and baptize; but that was in order to convert the world, and before any multitude of

[84] De Exhort. Castit. c. 7. (p. 522 a.) Nonne et laici sacerdotes sumus? Scriptum est, *Regnum quoque nos et sacerdotes Deo et Patri suo fecit*. Differentiam inter ordinem et plebem constituit ecclesiæ auctoritas, et honor per ordinis consessum sanctificatus a Deo, ubi [al. ibi] ecclesiastici ordinis non est consessus? Et offers et tinguis, sacerdos es tibi solus. Sed ubi tres, ecclesia est, licet laici, etc. [Others read, Ideo ubi ecclesiastici ordinis est consessus, et offert, et tinguit sacerdos, qui est ibi solus, etc. The Author has adopted this reading in his original quotation of the passage. See ed. 8vo. 1710. vol. 1. p. 42. Ed.]

[85] L. 1. c. 19. (v. 2. pp. 49, 50.)

[86] L. 1. [al. 10.] c. 9. (pp. 224, 225.)

[87] L. 1. c. 20. (v. 2. p. 53. 3.) Ἐγένοντο οὖν ἀμφότεροι κήρυκες τοῦ Χριστοῦ, etc.

[88] L. 1. c. 23. (v. 3. p. 54.) Παρὰ τοῖς Ἰνδοῖς κ. τ. λ.

[89] Hilar. Diacon. in Eph. 4. 11, 12. p. 248. (t. 2. append. p. 241 e.) Ut ergo cresceret plebs et multiplicaretur, omnibus inter initia concessum est et evangelizare et baptizare et scripturas in ecclesia explanare. Ubi autem omnia loca circumplexa est ecclesia, conventicula constituta sunt, et rectores et cetera officia in ecclesiis sunt ordinata, ut nullus de clericis auderet, qui ordinatus non esset, præsumere officium, quod sciret non sibi creditum.

ople were gathered, or churches founded, wherein to make a
stinction. But as soon as the Church began to spread itself
er the world, and sufficient numbers were converted to form
emselves into a regular society, then rulers and other eccle-
stical officers were appointed among them, and a distinction
ade, that no one,—no, not of the clergy themselves,—might
esume to meddle with any office not committed to him, and
which he knew himself not ordained.' So that, for ought
at appears to the contrary, we may conclude that the names
d offices of laymen and clergy were always distinct from one
other, from the first foundation of Christian churches.

5. The laymen were distinguished also by the name of *βιω-* Layi
τικοὶ, seculars, from *βίος,* which signifies *a secular life.* And also
this title they are discerned, not only from the clergy, but *βιωτ*
so from the ascetics, and those of a more retired life, who *secul*
d adieu to the world, and disburdened themselves of all
cular cares and business. Thus, St. Chrysostom[90], exhorting
men to read the Scriptures, says, 'Let no man think to
cuse himself by saying, I am a secular,—*ἀνὴρ βιωτικὸς,*—it
longs not to me to read the Scriptures, but to those that
ve retired from the world, and have taken up their abode in
e tops of the mountains.' And, in another place[91], com-
nting on those words of St. Paul, "Let every soul be subject
the higher powers," he says, 'This command is given to the
rgy, and to the monks, and not to the seculars only;' and
they are styled in the author who goes under the name of
stin Martyr[92], and others.

6. In some writers they are termed *ἰδιῶται, private men,* And
being only in a private capacity, and not acting as public *ται,* *men.*
nisters. So it was another name to distinguish them from
e clergy who were in the public office and employment of the
urch. St. Chrysostom[93] and Theodoret[94] say, the word

[90] Hom. 3. in Laz. (t. 1. p. 737 b.) *γάρ μοι λεγέτω τις τὰ ψυχρὰ ῥήματα ἐκεῖνα, καὶ πολλῆς καταγνώσεως α, Ὅτι .. ἀνήρ εἰμι βιωτικός· οὐκ ν ἐμὸν γραφὰς ἀναγινώσκειν, ἀλλ' ίνων τῶν ἀποταξαμένων, τῶν τὰς νφὰς τῶν ὀρέων κατειληφότων, ν τοῦτον τὸν βίον ἐχόντων διη-ῶν.*

[91] Hom. 23. in Rom. (t. 9. p. 686 b.) .... *Ταῦτα διατάττεται ἱερεῦσι, καὶ μοναχοῖς, οὐχὶ τοῖς βιωτικοῖς μόνον, κ. τ. λ.*

[92] Respons. ad Quæst. 19. (p. 402 a.) .... *Τῷ βιωτικῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, κ. τ. λ.*

[93] Hom. 35. in 1 Cor. 14. (t. 10. p. 325 d.) *Ἰδιώτην δὲ τὸν λαϊκὸν λέγει.*

[94] In 1 Cor. 14, 16. (t. 3. part. 1.

ἰδιώτης is so used by St. Paul himself, 1 Cor. xiv. 16, which we translate *unlearned;* but they say it signifies no more than a *layman*, or one in a private capacity, whether learned or unlearned, who is not a public minister of the Church: and so Origen also uses the name, ἰδιῶται, not for persons unlearned, but for *laymen*, who had power as well as other Christians to cast out devils in the name of Christ[95]. And Synesius[96] opposes the names ἰδιῶται and ἱερεῖς to one another, making the one to denote those who ministered in the sacred service of the Church, and the other those who had no such office, but served God only in a private capacity, as laymen. Whence also, speaking of some clergymen who deserved to be degraded, he says[97], 'they were to be treated publicly by all ὡς ἄντικρυς ἰδιῶται, *as mere private men*,' that is, no longer as clergymen, but laymen. Whence we may collect, that this was a common name for all such as had no public office or ministry in the Church.

per-
pro-
called
i.

7. On the other hand, all persons who had any public employment in the Church were called by the common name of *clerici;* which name at first was given only to the three superior orders of bishops, priests, and deacons, because there were then no other orders in the Church. But in the third century many inferior orders were appointed, as subservient to the deacon's office, such as sub-deacons, acolythists, readers, &c.; and then those also had the common name of *clerici* too, having no further concern with secular affairs, but wholly attending the service of the Church. St. Cyprian always gives these the name of *clerici*[98]; as where he speaks of Optatus, a sub-deacon, and Saturus, a reader, he styles them both *clerici*. The ordinations of such he calls *ordinationes clericæ*[99]; and

p. 259.) Ἰδιώτην καλεῖ τὸν ἐν τῷ λαϊκῷ τάγματι τεταγμένον.

[95] Cont. Cels. l. 7. p. 334. (t. 1. p. 596 d.) .... Οὓς [δαίμονας] οὐκ ὀλίγοι Χριστιανῶν ἀπελαύνουσι τῶν πασχόντων σὺν οὐδενὶ περιέργῳ καὶ μαγικῷ ἢ φαρμακευτικῷ πράγματι, ἀλλὰ μόνῃ εὐχῇ καὶ ὁρκώσεσιν ἁπλουστέραις· καὶ ὅσα ἂν δύναιτο προσάγειν ἁπλούστερος ἄνθρωπος; ὡς ἐπίταν γὰρ ἰδιῶται τὸ τοιοῦτον πράττουσι, κ.τ.λ.

[96] Ep. 54. ad Theoph. p. 144. (p. 190 b. 1.) Συχνοὶ παρ' ἡμῖν καὶ ἰδιῶται καὶ ἱερεῖς πλαττόμενοί τινας ὀνείρους.

[97] Ep. 67. p. 259. (p. 216. 6 & 7.) Δημοσίᾳ μὲν οὕτω προσοιστέον αὐτοῖς ὡς ἄντικρυς ἰδιώταις.

[98] Ep. 24. al. 29. Ed. Oxon. (p. 208.) Et quoniam oportuit me per clericos scribere, etc., fecisse me sciatis lectorem Saturum, et hypodiaconum Optatum.

[99] Ep. 33. al. 38. Ed. Oxon. (Ep. 1. p. 170.) .... Qui in ecclesia

e letters which he had occasion to send to foreign parts · hands, had the name of *literæ clericæ*[1]. Lucian[2], tyr and Cyprian's contemporary, speaks in the same ncerning exorcists and readers.

Council of Nice itself[3] gives the appellation of *κλῆρος* to esides bishops, presbyters, and deacons; and the third of Carthage[4] made a canon on purpose to confirm the hem.

a, the same Council[5] seems rather to appropriate the *rici* to the inferior orders, by way of distinction from rior, first naming bishops, presbyters, and deacons, and *clerici*, or *clerks* that is, the inferior orders. And the done by St. Ambrose[6], and Hilary[7] under his name, pressly, who speak of the *clerici* as distinct from the As also Epiphanius[8], who, speaking of those that n Egypt in the Diocletian persecution, says, 'some of re soldiers, some clerks of divers orders, some presby- d some deacons.' Where the *clerici* are spoken of as from presbyters and deacons; and so in the Council of [9] and many other places.

The n *clerici* somet appro to the rior o

to the reason of the name *clerici* and *clerus*, St. The n

d ordinationem clericalem ne clerica] promoventur,

3. (Ep. 9. p. 182.).. Per- ve est si epistolæ clericæ endacio aliquo et fraude est.— See Fell's note in f. not. 1. et 9. p. ead.) omine epistola hæc clerica etc.

17. al. 23. ap. Cypr. Præsente de clero, et et lectore, Lucianus scrip-

(t. 2. p. 29 d.) Ἀπηγόλου ἡ μεγάλη σύνοδος, μήτε μήτε πρεσβυτέρῳ, μήτε διτε [leg. μήθ'] ὅλως τῷ ἐν ἐξεῖναι συνείσακτον [al. ἔχειν, πλὴν εἰ μὴ ἄρα μηλ.

1. (t. 2. p. 1170 c.) Cleri- tem nomen etiam lectores tæ et ostiarii retinent.

(ibid. p. 1169 e.) Item episcopi, et presbyteri, et diaconi, vel clerici non sint conductores.

[6] De Dignit. Sacerd. c. 3. (t. 2. append. p. 360 b.) Aliud est quod ab episcopo requirit Deus, aliud quod a presbytero, et aliud quod a diacono, et aliud quod a clerico, et aliud quod a laico.

[7] Pseud-Ambr. in Eph. 4. 11, 12. (t. 2. append. 241 f.) Nunc neque diaconi in populo prædicant, neque clerici vel laici baptizant.

[8] Hær. 68. Melet. n. 11. (t. 1. p. 717 c.) Παραπέσοντες οὖν, καὶ θύσαντες, καὶ παράβαντες, προσῆλθον τοῖς ὁμολογηταῖς τε καὶ μάρτυσιν, ὅπως τύχωσιν ἐλέους διὰ μετανοίας, οἱ μὲν ἀπὸ στρατιωτῶν ὄντες, οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ κληρικῶν ὑπάρχοντες διαφόρου κλήρου, πρεσβυτερίου τε καὶ διακονίας καὶ ἄλλων, κ. τ. λ.

[9] C. 20. (t. 1. p. 1500 d.) Ὁμοίως δὲ ἔχειν τιμὴν καὶ τοὺς διακόνους ὑπὸ τῶν ὑπηρετῶν καὶ πάντων τῶν κληρικῶν.

same Jerom[10] rightly observes, that it comes from the Greek κλῆρος, which signifies *a lot;* and thence he says, 'God's Ministers were called *clerici*, either because they are the lot and portion of the Lord, or because the Lord is their lot, that is, their inheritance.' Others[11] think some regard was had to the ancient custom of choosing persons into sacred offices by lot, both among Jews and Gentiles; which is not improbable, though that custom never generally prevailed among Christians, as shall be shewed hereafter.

all-nici. 10. There is another name for the clergy very commonly to be met with in the ancient Councils, which is that of *canonici*, a name derived from the Greek word κανὼν, which signifies, among other things, *the roll* or *catalogue* of every Church, wherein the names of all the ecclesiastics were written, and which was, as it were, *the rule* of knowing to what Church they belonged. In this sense the word κανὼν is often used by the Council of Nice[12]. The Council of Antioch[13] calls it ἅγιος κανὼν, *the sacred roll;* the Apostolical Canons[14], κατάλογος ἱερατικὸς, *the catalogue of the clergy;* which is the same that Sidonius Apollinaris[15] calls *albus;* and the Council of Agde[16], by the name of *matricula;* and St. Austin[17], *tabula clericorum.* Now because the names of all the clergy were enrolled in this catalogue or canon, they were hence called *canonici.* As in St. Cyril[18] κανονικῶν παρουσία signifies *the presence of the*

[10] Ep. 2. [al. 52.] ad. Nepot. (t. 1. p. 256 e.) . . . κλῆρος Græce, *sors* Latine appellatur: propterea vocantur clerici, vel quia de sorte sunt Domini, vel quia ipse Dominus sors, id est, pars clericorum est.

[11] Dodw. Dissert. 1. in Cypr. s. 15. (append. p. 6.) In *sacerdotum* autem negotiis veterum adeo frequens erat, a prima usque antiquitate, *sortium* usus, &c.

[12] C. 16. (t. 2. p. 36 e.) Ὅσοι ῥιψοκινδύνως, μήτε τὸν φόβον τοῦ Θεοῦ πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν ἔχοντες, μήτε τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κανόνα εἰδότες, ἀναχωρήσουσι τῆς ἐκκλησίας, κ.τ.λ.—C. 17. (p. 37 b.) . . . καθαιρεθήσεται τοῦ κλήρου, καὶ ἀλλότριος τοῦ κανόνος ἔσται. C. 19. (p. 37 e.) Ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ περὶ τῶν διακονισσῶν, καὶ ὅλως περὶ τῶν ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ κανόνι ἐξεταζομένων, ὁ αὐτὸς τύπος παραφυλαχθήσεται.

[13] C. 1. (t. 2. p. 561 c.) Τοὺς δὲ καθαιρεθέντας ἀποστερεῖσθαι καὶ τῆς ἔξωθεν τιμῆς, ἧς ὁ ἅγιος κανὼν καὶ τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἱερατεῖον μετείληφεν.

[14] C. 13, 14. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 439.) [Εἴ τις] ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος, ἢ ὅλως τοῦ καταλόγου τοῦ ἱερατικοῦ, κ.τ.λ.—It. c. 43 al. 51. (Cotel. p. 445.) Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος, κ.τ.λ.

[15] L. 6. Ep. 8. (p. 393.) Nomen lectorum *albus* nuper excepit.

[16] C. 2. (t. 4. p. 1383 b.] Rescripti in matricula gradum suum dignitatemque recipiant [al. suscipiant.]

[17] Hom. 50 de Divers. [al. Serm. 356.] t. 10. p. 523. (t. 5. p. 1390 c.) . . . Delebo eum de tribu clericorum.

[18] Præf. Catech. n. 3. [al. 4.] (p. 4 b.) Θεωρεῖς μοι τάξιν, καὶ ἐπιστήμην; γραφῶν ἀνάγνωσιν; κανονικῶν παρουσίαν; κ.τ.λ.

; and *κανονικοὶ ψαλται*, in the Council of Laodicea[19], ɔs *such of the clergy as were ordered to sing* in the h. And so generally, in the Councils of Nice[20] and An-, *οἱ ἐν τῷ κανόνι* is put to denote the clergy of the h. And upon the same account all others, whose names et down in the Church's books, to entitle them to receive nance from the Church, were called by the same name, *ci*, such as the monks, virgins, widows, &c., whom St. speaks of under this name, as Balsamon and Zonaras tand him.

I pass over many other names of the clergy, which are s to every reader: such as that of *ecclesiastics*, and *οἱ*, or *τάξις ἱερατικὴ*, *the holy order*, &c., and shall but otice of one more, which rarely occurs any where but in ry Nazianzen, who gives the clergy, especially the supe-ergy, the name of *τάξις τοῦ βήματος*, *the order of the ary*[23]: which name was given them from their privilege ring into that part of the church where the altar stood, as we shall see when we come to speak of churches, was *βῆμα* or *ἱερατεῖον*, *the sanctuary*. Hither none might but the clergy, who were therefore called *the order of ctuary*. Whence in the same author[24] *τῷ βήματι προσ-* ignifies, *to give a man ordination*, or *make him a cler-*; and *ὁ ἀπὸ βήματος* is *one of the sacred order*, or *one of rgy*.

And *τάξις τοῦ βήματος*, *the order of the sanctuary*.

15. (t. 1. p. 1500 a.) Περὶ ἐν πλέον τῶν κακονικῶν ψαλ-ν ἐπὶ τὸν ἄμβωνα ἀναβαινόν-ὶ ἀπὸ διφθέρας ψαλλόντων, τινὰς ψάλλειν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ.

16. (t. 2. p. 37 a.) Ὁ ἐν τῷ ξεταζόμενος.—C. 17. (ibid. a.) πολλοὶ ἐν τῷ κανόνι ἐξεταζό-ν πλεονεξίαν καὶ τὴν αἰσχρο-διώκοντες, κ. τ. λ.

2. (t. 2. p. 561 e.) Εἴ τις ῶν ἐπισκόπων, πρεσβυτέρων, ων, ἤ τις τοῦ κανόνος, κ. τ. λ. (ibid. p. 564 e.) Ὁ αὐτὸς ἐπὶ λαϊκῶν, καὶ πρεσβυτέρων, όνων, καὶ πάντων ἐν τῷ κα-

p. Canon. c. 6. (CC. t. 2. e.) Τῶν κανονικῶν τὰς πορ-νειας εἰς γάμον μὴ καταλογίζεσθαι, ἀλλὰ παντὶ τρόπῳ διασπᾶν αὐτῶν τὴν συνάφειαν.

23 Orat. 20. in Laud. Basil. (t. 1. (p. 336 b.) Τὰς ἱερὰς πρότερον ὑπαναγινώσκων τῷ λαῷ βίβλους, ὁ τούτων ἐξηγητὴς, καὶ ταύτην οὐκ ἀπαξιώσας τὴν τάξιν τοῦ βήματος, κ. τ. λ.

24 Orat. 19. de Fun. Patr. (ibid. p. 299 d.) Τίς δὲ μετὰ Θεοῦ μᾶλλον, ἢ τῷ βήματι προσήγαγεν, ἢ τὰς κατ' αὐτοῦ ὕβρεις ἐζηλοτύπησεν, κ. τ. λ.—Ibid. (p. 311 c.) . . . . . Τοὺς ἱερέας, τούς τε ἄλλους, καὶ ὅσοι τοῦ βήματος, διεμαρτύρετο.—Orat. 20. (p. 351 c.) . . . . Περιτρέπει γὰρ, καὶ εἰ μή τις τῶν ἐκ τοῦ βήματος ὑποσχὼν τὴν χεῖρα τὴν περιτροπὴν ἔστησε, κἂν κατηνέχθη πτῶμα διακρύων ἄξιον, εἶεν.

BOOK II.

OF THE SEVERAL ORDERS OF THE CLERGY IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

CHAP. I.

Of the original of bishops; and that they were a distinct order from presbyters in the primitive Church.

1. WE have hitherto considered the clergy in general, as distinct from the laity, and come now to examine by what names or offices they were distinguished from one another. And here the most ancient distinction that occurs is that of the superior clergy into the three distinct orders of bishops, presbyters, and deacons. That there were no other orders in the Church but these three at first, will be evidenced in its proper place[25], when I come to give an account of the first rise and original of the inferior orders; and, that deacons were always a sacred and standing order, will be proved likewise, when I speak particularly of them[26]. Here then it remains, that our inquiry be made only into the distinction betwixt the orders of bishops and presbyters; and this, so far as concerns matter of fact, and the practice of the Church, which is the thing I have undertaken to give an account of, will be most fairly and fully resolved, by considering only these three things. 1. That the ancient writers of the Church always speak of these as distinct orders. 2. That they derive the original of bishops from divine authority and apostolical constitution. 3. That they give us particular accounts and catalogues of such bishops as were first settled and consecrated, in the new-founded churches, by the hands of the Apostles.

But before I proceed to the proof of these things, I must premise one particular, to prevent all ambiguity, that I take the word *order* in that sense as the Ancients use it, and not as

[25] See b. 3. c. 1. ss. 1, 2, 6. [26] See b. 2. c. 20. s. 1.

the Schoolmen do; who, for reasons of their own, dis- between *order* and *jurisdiction*, and make bishops and ers to be one and the same order, only differing in nd jurisdiction. This distinction was unknown to the ; among whom the words, *order*, *degree*, *office*, *power*, *sdiction*, when they speak of the superiority of bishops resbyters, mean but one and the same thing, viz. the f the supreme governors of the Church, conferred upon their ordination, over presbyters, who are to do no- it in subordination to them. St. Jerom, who will be to speak the sense of the Ancients, makes no difference words, *ordo*, *gradus*, *officium*, but uses them promis- to signify the power and jurisdiction of bishops above ers and the whole Church; which is, properly speaking, essence of their order. Therefore, sometimes he calls ferent orders, as in his Book against Jovinian[27], where 'that both in the Old and New Testament, the high- are one order, the priests another, and the Levites ' So, in his Epistles to Rusticus[82] and Fabiola[92], where *ordo* and *gradus* together. In other places he uses the *adus* only; as, in his Epistle to Eustochium[30], he calls ers *priests of the inferior degree;* and, in his Epistle dore[31], deacons *the third degree;* and, in his Com- on Micah[32], bishops, priests, and deacons, *the de- the Church*. At other times he expresses his mean- he word *offices;* as, where he says, 'that *bishop*, *pres- d deacon* are not names of men's merits, but of their

. Jovin. l. 2. p. 89. (t. 2. p. . In Veteri Testamento, et alium ordinem pontifex m sacerdotes, alium le-

d Rustic. t. 1. p. 46. [al. (t. 1. p. 936 c.) Singuli m episcopi, singuli archi- , singuli archidiaconi, et lo ecclesiasticus suis rec- titur.

'abiol. de 42. Mansion. Is- . 44. [al. Ep. 78.] (ibid. p. sos secundi ordinis intel- receptores, Luca Evange- nte, duodecim fuisse apo- stolos, et septuaginta discipulos minoris gradus.

[30] Ep. 27. ad Eustoch. [al. Ep. 108.] (ibid. p. 716 c.) Aderant Hierosolymarum et aliarum urbium episcopi, et sacerdotum inferioris gradus, et levitarum innumerabilis multitudo.

[31] Ep. 1. ad Heliodor. [al. Ep. 14.] (ibid. p. 34 b.) ... Non minorem in tertio gradu adhibuit diligentiam, etc.

[32] In Mic. 7. p. 162. (t. 6. p. 518 c.) Nec hoc dico, quod istiusmodi gradibus in ecclesia non debeatis esse subjecti.

offices[33].' So that it is all one, according to St. Jerom, whether we say, the order, or the degree, or the office, or the power and jurisdiction of a bishop; for all these are intended to express the same thing, viz. the authority of bishops over their presbyters and the whole Church. And in this sense I use the word *order* in this discourse, to express the opinion of the Ancients concerning the different powers of bishops and presbyters in the Church.

2. Now that there was such a distinction always observed in the Church is evident, 1st, from the testimony of the most ancient writers, who speak of bishops, presbyters, and deacons as distinct degrees in the Church, and the two latter as subordinate to the first. The testimonies of Ignatius[34] to this purpose are so full and evident, that nothing was ever pretended to be said against them, save only, that they are not the genuine remains of that ancient author; which has been so

[33] Cont. Jovin. l. 1. p. 41. (t. 2. p. 293 b.) Cernis igitur quod episcopus, presbyter, et diaconus non ideo sint beati, quia episcopi vel presbyteri sint aut diaconi, sed si virtutes habuerint nominum suorum et officiorum. Alioqui si diaconus sanctior episcopo suo fuerit, non ex eo quod inferior gradu est, apud Christum deterior erit.

[34] Ep. ad Ephes. n. 2. (Cotel. v. 2. p. 12.) . . Ἵνα ἐπιτασσόμενοι [al. ὑποτασσόμενοι] τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ κατὰ πάντα ἦτε ἡγιασμένοι.—Ibid. n. 3. (p. 12.) . . . Ὡς καὶ οἱ ἐπίσκοποι οἱ κατὰ τὰ πέρατα ὁρισθέντες ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ γνώμῃ εἰσίν. [Jacobson and others omit ἐν, and read γνώμη in the nominative case. See the note in loc. Ed.]—Ibid. n. 4. (p. 12.) Ὅθεν πρέπει ὑμῖν συντρέχειν τῇ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου γνώμῃ· ὅπερ καὶ ποιεῖτε· τὸ γὰρ ἀξιονόμαστον ὑμῶν πρεσβυτέριον, τοῦ Θεοῦ ἄξιον, οὕτως συνήρμοσται τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, ὡς χορδαὶ κιθάρᾳ.—Ep. ad Philadelph. n. 4. (Cotel. p. 32.) . . . . . Ἓν θυσιαστήριον ὡς εἷς ἐπίσκοπος, ἅμα τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ καὶ διακόνοις τοῖς συνδούλοις μου, ἵνα ὃ ἐὰν πράσσητε κατὰ Θεὸν πράσσητε.—Ibid. n. 7. (p. 32.) . . . Τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ προσέχετε, καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ, καὶ διακόνοις.—Ibid. n. 10. (p. 33.) . . . . Θέλουσιν δὲ ὑμῖν οὐκ ἐστιν ἀδύνατον ὑπὲρ ὀνόματος Θεοῦ, ὡς καὶ αἱ ἔγγιστα ἐκκλησίαι ἔπεμψαν ἐπισκόπους, αἱ δὲ πρεσβυτέρους καὶ διακόνους. — Ep. ad Smyrn. n. 8. (Cotel. p. 37.) Πάντες τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ἀκολουθεῖτε, ὡς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τῷ Πατρί· καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ ὡς τοῖς ἀποστόλοις· τοὺς δὲ διακόνους ἐντρέπεσθε, ὡς Θεοῦ ἐντολήν.—Ibid. n. 12. (p. 38.) Ἀσπάζομαι τὸν ἀξιόθεον ἐπίσκοπον, καὶ θεοπρεπέστατον πρεσβυτέριον, καὶ τοὺς συνδούλους μου διακόνους, κ. τ. λ.—Ep. ad Trall. n. 7. (Cotel. p. 66.) . . . Ὁ χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου καὶ πρεσβυτέρων [al. πρεσβυτερίου] καὶ τῶν διακόνων τι πράσσων, κ. τ. λ.—Ibid. n. 12. (p. 71.) Πρέπει γὰρ ὑμῖν τοῖς καθ' ἕνα, ἐξαιρέτως καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις, ἀναψύχειν τὸν ἐπίσκοπον, κ. τ. λ. —Ibid. n. 13. (p. 71.) Ἔρρωσθε ἐν Κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, ὑποτασσόμενοι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ [ὡς τῇ ἐντολῇ], ὁμοίως καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις [al. τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ·] καὶ τοῖς διακόνοις· κ. τ. λ.—Ep. ad Polycarp. n. 6. (Cotel. p. 96.) Τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ προσέχετε, ἵνα καὶ ὁ Θεὸς ὑμῖν. Ἀντίψυχον ἐγὼ τῶν ὑποτασσομένων ἐπισκόπῳ, πρεσβυτερίῳ, [πρεσβυτέροις,] διακόνοις.

often considered and replied to by learned men[35], that there is no pretence left to favour such an imagination. The citations are too numerous to be here inserted at large, and therefore I shall only give the reader a specimen in one single testimony, by which he may judge of all the rest. In his Epistle to the Magnesians[36], he exhorts them 'to do all things in unity, under the bishop presiding in the place of God, and the presbyters in the place of the apostolical senate, and the deacons, to whom is committed the ministry and service of Jesus Christ.'

The author of the Acts of the martyrdom of Ignatius[37], lately published from an ancient Greek copy, speaks exactly in the same manner of these three orders, when he says, 'that, as Ignatius was on his journey to Rome, all the cities and churches of Asia sent to salute him by their bishops, presbyters, and deacons.' Not long after these authors lived Pius, bishop of Rome, whose authority I cite, because Blondel[38] allows it to be genuine. This author, in his Epistle to Justus of Vienna, gives him the title of bishop[39], and speaks of presbyters and deacons under him. In the beginning of the next age we have the testimonies of Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, and Tertullian, all agreeing in the same thing, that there were then, in their own times, the different orders of bishops and presbyters in the Church. 'There are here in the Church,' says Clemens[40], 'the different degrees or progressions of

[35] Pearson, Vind. Ignat. (Cotel. v. 2. append. pp. 247, seqq.)—Usser. de Ep. Ignat. (ibid. pp. 183, seqq.) —Voss. Ep. ad Rivet. [Vid. Voss. Præf. in Ep. Ignat.] (Cotel. v. 2. p. 8.)—Cotel. Judic. de Ep. Ignat. (ibid. p. 9.) et not. passim.

[36] Ep. ad Magnes. n. 6. (Cotel. ibid. p. 18. *Σπουδάζατε πάντα πράσσειν προκαθημένου τοῦ ἐπισκόπου εἰς τόπον Θεοῦ, καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων εἰς τόπον συνεδρίου τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ τῶν διακόνων, τῶν ἐμοὶ γλυκυτάτων, πεπιστευμένων διακονίαν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, κ. τ. λ.*

[37] Ap. Grab. Spicileg. sæc. 2. (t. 1. p. 12.) *Ἐδεξιοῦντο τὸν ἅγιον διὰ τῶν ἐπισκόπων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων καὶ διακόνων αἱ τῆς Ἀσίας πόλεις καὶ ἐκκλησίαι, κ. τ. λ.* [Conf. Cotel. Martyr. Ignat. n. 10. (v. 2. p. 164.) *Εἶτα καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἐπισκόποις, πρεσβυτέροις τε καὶ διακόνοις ... ἐπεὶ πολλοὶ συνέθεον ἀπὸ τῶν τῆς Ἀσίας ἐκκλησίων καὶ τῶν πόλεων, κ. τ. λ.* ED.]

[38] Apol. s. 2. n. 4. (p. 18.) Imo quid Pium, etc.

[39] Ep. 2. ad Just. Vienn. (CC. t. 1. p. 577 a.) .... Tu vero apud senatoriam Viennam [al. urbem Viennensem] ..... colobio episcoporum vestitus ..... Presbyteri et diaconi .... te observent.

[40] Strom. l. 6. p. 667. (p. 793. 26.) *Καὶ αἱ ἐνταῦθα κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν προκοπαὶ, ἐπισκόπων, πρεσβυτέρων, διακόνων, μιμήματα, οἶμαι, ἀγγελικῆς δόξης.* Conf. Pædagog. l. 3. c. 12. p. 264. See s. 3. p. 51. n. 49.

bishops, presbyters, and deacons, in imitation of the angelical glory.' Origen takes notice of this distinction above ten times[41] in his works, which those that please may read at large in Bishop Pearson. I shall only recite two passages, one out of his Homilies upon St. Luke, written whilst he was a layman, where he says[42], 'that bigamy excludes men from all ecclesiastical dignities; for one that is twice married can neither be made bishop, presbyter, nor deacon.' Here he calls them different dignities; in the other place[43] he calls them different degrees, saying, 'Every one shall be punished according to his degree. If the supreme governor of the Church offends, he shall have the greater punishment. A layman will deserve mercy in comparison of a deacon, and a deacon in comparison of a presbyter.' So that bishops, in his opinion, were then a degree above presbyters and deacons. Tertullian[44] frequently mentions the same distinction; but more especially in his book *De Baptismo*, where he says[45], 'The right of baptizing belongs to the chief priest who is the bishop; and after him, to presbyters and deacons; yet not without the authority of the bishop, for the honour of the Church, in the preservation of which consists the Church's peace.'

[41] Hom. 2. in Numer. (t. 2. p. 278 a.) Ecce qualis episcopus, aut qualis presbyter, vel qualis diaconus. — Hom. 6. in Esai. (t. 3. p. 117 c.) Nemo enim, quibuscunque venientibus, assumens linteum diaconus, vel presbyter, sive episcopus, lavat pedes. — Hom. 5. in Ezek. (ibid. p. 375 e.) .... Pro modo graduum. See before, b. 1. c. 3. s. 1. p. 28. n. 40.—In Matth. 19. (ibid. p. 646 a.) ..... *Μήποτε ἐπεὶ σύμβολόν ἐστι καὶ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος, καὶ ὁ διάκονος ἀληθινῶν κατὰ τὰ ὀνόματα ταῦτα πραγμάτων.*—In Matt. 21. 12. (ibid. p. 752 a.) *Καὶ νομίζω ἁρμόζειν τὸν περὶ τῶν πωλούντων τὰς περιστερὰς λόγον τοῖς παραδιδοῦσι τὰς ἐκκλησίας αἰσχροκερδέσι, καὶ τυραννικοῖς, καὶ ἀνεπιστήμοσι, καὶ ἀνευλαβέσιν ἐπισκόποις, ἢ πρεσβυτέροις, ἢ διακόνοις.*

[42] Hom. 17. in Luc. (ibid. p. 953 e.) Ab ecclesiasticis dignitatibus non solum fornicatio, sed et nuptiæ repellunt. Neque enim episcopus, nec presbyter, nec diaconus, nec vidua possunt esse digami.

[43] Hom. 5. in Ezek. (ibid. p. 375 e.) ..... Pro modo graduum, etc. See before, b. 1. c. 3. s. 1. p. 28. n. 40.

[44] De Monogam. c. 11. (p. 531 c.) .... Non licet habere ab episcopo monogamo, a presbyteris, et diaconis ejusdem sacramenti, etc.?—De Fug. c. 11. (p. 540 d.) Sed quum ipsi auctores, id est, ipsi diaconi, presbyteri, et episcopi fugiunt, quomodo laicus intelligere poterit, etc.?—De Præscript. c. 41. (p. 217 c.) Itaque alius hodie episcopus, cras alius: hodie diaconus, qui cras lector: hodie presbyter, qui cras laicus.

[45] De Bapt. c. 17. (p. 230 c.) Dandi quidem habet jus summus sacerdos, qui est episcopus: dehinc presbyteri et diaconi; non tamen sine episcopi auctoritate propter ecclesiæ honorem, quo salvo, salva pax est.

These allegations are sufficient evidences as to matter of fact, and the practice of the Church in the three first ages, that there was then an order of chief-priests or bishops, superior to presbyters, settled and allowed in the Christian Church.

The order of bishops of apostolical institution.

3. If we proceed a little further into this inquiry, and examine from what original this appointment came, whether from ecclesiastical or apostolical institution, which is another question concerning matter of fact, that will in some measure determine the right also. The same authors, with the unanimous consent of all others, declare, that it was no human invention, but an original settlement of the Apostles themselves, which they made by Divine appointment. 'The order of bishops,' says Tertullian[46], 'when it is traced up to its original, will be found to have St. John for one of its authors.' This agrees exactly with what Clemens Alexandrinus[47] has recorded of him 'that when he was settled at Ephesus, he went about the neighbouring regions, ordaining bishops, and setting apart such men for the clergy as were signified to him by the Holy Ghost.' These were those Asiatic bishops that St. Jerom[48] speaks of, who says, 'that at their request St. John wrote his Gospel against the heresies of Ebion and Cerinthus.' Whence it follows, that, according to this account, the order of bishops was settled before the canon of Scripture was concluded. Whence Clemens of Alexandria[49] further observes, 'that there are many precepts in Scripture appertaining to particular sorts of persons, some to presbyters, some to deacons, and some to bishops also.' Irenæus declares himself of the same opinion, that there were bishops as well as presbyters in the Apostles' days; for 'the assembly of Miletus,' he says[50], 'was composed of bishops and presbyters that

[46] Adv. Marcion. l. 4. c. 5. (p. 415 d.) Habemus et Joannis alumnas ecclesias. Nam, etsi Apocalypsin ejus Marcion respuit, ordo tamen episcoporum ad originem recensus in Joannem stabit auctorem.

[47] See before b. 1. c. 5. s. 2. p. 36. n. 76. See also Euseb. l. 3. c. 23. (v. 1. p. 112. 10.) Ἐπὶ τούτοις κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν, κ. τ. λ.

[48] De Scriptor. Eccles. in Joanne. [al. c. 9.] (t. 2. p. 829.) .... Novissimus omnium scripsit evangelium, rogatus ab Asiæ episcopis.

[49] Pædagog. l. 3. c. 12. p. 264. (p. 309. 24.) Μυρίαι δὲ ὅσαι ὑποθῆκαι, εἰς πρόσωπα ἐκλεκτὰ διατείνουσαι, ἐγγεγράφαται ταῖς βίβλοις ταῖς ἁγίαις· αἱ μὲν, πρεσβυτέροις· αἱ δὲ, ἐπισκόποις· αἱ δὲ διακόνοις· ἄλλαι, χήραις.

[50] L. 3. c. 14. (p. 235. 41.) In

were of Ephesus and the neighbouring cities of Asia.' And therefore, agreeably to that hypothesis, he always derives the succession of bishops and their original from the Apostles; as where he says[51], 'that Hyginus, bishop of Rome, was the ninth in order of episcopal succession from the Apostles[52].' And, in another place[53], giving an exact catalogue of the twelve bishops of Rome, that governed successively in that see to his own time, he says of Linus, the first of them, 'that he was ordained bishop immediately, by the Apostles, upon the first foundation of the Church;' and of Eleutherius, the last of them, 'that he was the twelfth bishop from the Apostles.' Tertullian[54] insists much upon the same argument, and makes a challenge to all sorts of heretics upon it: 'Let them shew us the original of their churches, and give us a catalogue of their bishops in an exact succession, from first to last, whereby it may appear, that their first bishop had either some Apostle or some apostolical man living in the time of the Apostles for his author or immediate predecessor. For thus it is that apostolical Churches make their reckoning:—the Church of Smyrna counts up to Polycarp, ordained by St. John; the Church of Rome to Clemens, ordained by St. Peter; and so all other

Mileto enim convocatis episcopis et presbyteris, qui erant ab Epheso et a reliquis proximis civitatibus.

[51] L. 1. c. 28. (p. 103. 11.) ...Ἐπὶ Ὑγίνου, ἕνατον κληρὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπικῆς διαδοχῆς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἔχοντος,—qui nonum locum episcopatus per successionem ab apostolis habuit.

[52] As cited by Euseb. l. 4. c. 10 and 11. (v. 1. pp. 154 seqq.)

[53] L. 3. c. 3. (p. 202. 1.) Fundantes et instruentes beati apostoli ecclesiam Lino episcopatum administrandæ ecclesiæ tradiderunt.—Cited also by Eusebius, l. 5. c. 6. (v. 1. p. 217. 7.) Θεμελιώσαντες οὖν κ. τ. λ.

[54] De Præscript. c. 32. (p. 213.) Edant ergo origines ecclesiarum suarum: evolvant ordinem episcoporum suorum, ita per successiones ab initio decurrentem, ut primus ille episcopus aliquem ex apostolis, vel apostolicis viris, qui tamen cum apostolis perseveraverint, habuerit auctorem et antecessorem. Hoc enim modo ecclesiæ apostolicæ census suos deferunt: sicut Smyrnæorum ecclesia Polycarpum ab Johanne conlocatum refert: sicut Romanorum Clementem a Petro ordinatum edit: perinde [al. proinde] utique et cæteræ exhibent, quos ab apostolis in episcopatum constitutos, apostolici seminis traduces habeant. —Vid. ibid. c. 36. (p. 215 a.) Percurre ecclesias apostolicas, apud quas ipsæ adhuc cathedræ apostolorum, etc.—It. Polycrat. Ep. ap. Euseb. l. 5. c. 24. (v. 1. p. 243. 19.) Καὶ γὰρ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν, κ. τ. λ.—Cypr. Ep. 52. al. 55. ad Antonian (p. 243.) Cum Fabiani locus, id est, locus Petri et gradus cathedræ sacerdotalis vacaret. — Ep. 27. al. 33. (p. 216.) Dominus noster.... dicit Petro; Ego tibi dico, quia tu es Petrus, etc. Inde per temporum et successionum vices episcoporum ordinatio et ecclesiæ ratio decurrit, etc.

Churches in like manner exhibit their first bishops ordained by the Apostles, by whom the apostolical seed was propagated and conveyed to others.'

This implies, that the Apostles, as they founded Churches, settled bishops in them; and that this might be proved from the records and archives of every Church, the most of which were probably then remaining, when Tertullian made this challenge to all heretics, and appealed to these original records in behalf of the Catholic Church.

A list or catalogue of such bishops as were first ordained by the Apostles.

4. An exact and authentic catalogue of these first foundations would be a very useful and entertaining thing, but, at this distance of time, it is impossible to gratify the world with any such curiosity, whatever pains should be taken about it. Yet there are some scattered remains and fragments to be collected out of the ancient writers, which will sufficiently answer our present design; which is to evidence that the Apostles settled bishops in all Churches, upon their first plantation.

To begin with the Church of Rome;—we have already heard Irenæus and Tertullian declaring, that the Apostles ordained a bishop there. And the same is asserted by St. Chrysostom[55], and Eusebius[56], and Ruffin[57], and St. Jerom[58], and Optatus[59], and Epiphanius[60], and St. Austin[61], who says, 'If the order of bishops succeeding one another be of any consideration, we take the surest and soundest way who begin to

[55] Hom. 10. in 2 Tim. (t. 11. p. 724 c.) *Τοῦτον τὸν Λῖνον ἱστοροῦσί τινες δεύτερον μετὰ τὸν Πέτρον ἐπίσκοπον τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας γεγενῆσθαι.*

[56] L. 3. c. 4. (v. 1. p. 91. 31.).... *Τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν ἀκολούθων τοῦ Παύλου, Κρίσκης μὲν ἐπὶ τὰς Γαλλίας στειλάμενος ὑπ' αὐτοῦ μαρτυρεῖται, Λῖνος δὲ, οὗ μέμνηται συνόντος ἐπὶ Ῥώμης αὐτῷ κατὰ τὴν δευτέραν πρὸς Τιμόθεον ἐπιστολὴν, πρῶτος μετὰ Πέτρον τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν ἤδη πρότερον κληρωθεὶς δεδήλωται.*

[57] Ap. Hieron. Apol. 2. p. 219. (t. 2. p. 507 e.) Clemens, ... apostolorum discipulus, qui Romanæ ecclesiæ post apostolos episcopus et martyr fuit, etc.

[58] De Scriptor. Eccles. in Clement. [al. c. 15.] (t. 2. p. 839.) Clemens ..... quartus post Petrum Romæ episcopus ..... tametsi plerique Latinorum secundum post Petrum apostolum putent fuisse Clementem.

[59] L. 2. p. 48. (p. 36.) .... Sedit prior Petrus, cui successit Linus, etc.

[60] Hær. 27. Carpocrat. n. 6. (t. i p. 107 a.) *Ἐν Ῥώμῃ γὰρ γεγόνασι πρῶτοι Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος οἱ ἀπόστολοι αὐτοὶ καὶ ἐπίσκοποι, εἶτα Λῖνος, εἶτα Κλῆτος, εἶτα Κλήμης, σύγχρονος ὢν Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου, κ.τ.λ.*

[61] Ep. 165. [al. 53.] (t. 2. p. 120 f.) Si ordo episcoporum sibi succedentium considerandus est, quanto certius et vere salubriter ab ipso Petro numeramus? .... Petro enim successit Linus, Lino Clemens, Clementi Anacletus, etc.

number from St. Peter; for Linus succeeded Peter; and Clemens. Linus; and Anacletus, Clemens,' &c.

It is true there is a little difference in the account which these authors give of the succession; for some reckon Linus first. then Anacletus, then Clemens. Others begin with Clemens, and reckon him the first in order from St. Peter. But this is easily reconciled by learned men[62], who make it appear that Linus and Anacletus died whilst St. Peter lived; and that Clemens was ordained their successor by St. Peter also. So that we have two or three persons, by this account, ordained successively bishops of Rome by the hands of the Apostles.

Next, for the Church of Jerusalem;—it is unanimously delivered by all ancient writers, that James, the Lord's brother, was the first bishop thereof. St. Jerom[63] says, 'he was ordained by the Apostles, immediately after our Lord's crucifixion.' Epiphanius[64] calls him therefore the first bishop; the first who had an episcopal chair; the first to whom Christ committed his own throne upon earth. Chrysostom[65] says 'he was made bishop by Christ himself.' The author[66] of the Apostolical Constitutions, 'both by Christ and the Apostles.' In like manner, Eusebius[67] always speaks of him unde

[62] Cotel. Not. in Const. Apost. l. 7. c. 46. (v. 1. pp. 382 seqq.)—Pearson, de Success. Roman. Pontif. dissert. 2. c. 2. int. Oper. posthum. — Cave, Hist. Liter. in Clement. (v. 1. p. 17. n. 65.) Fateor me, etc.

[63] De Scriptor. Eccles. [al. c. 2.] (t. 2. p. 815.) .... Post passionem Domini statim ab apostolis Hierosolymorum episcopus ordinatus. —In Gal. 1. p. 165. (t. 7. p. 396 d.) Hic Jacobus episcopus Hierosolymorum primus fuit.

[64] Hær. 29. Nazar. n. 3. (t. i. p. 119 a.) Κατασταθέντος εὐθὺς Ἰακὼβ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ Κυρίου, καλουμένου καὶ ἀποστόλου, ἐπισκόπου πρώτου, υἱοῦ τοῦ Ἰωσὴφ φύσει ὄντος, κ.τ.λ.—Hær. 66. Manich. n. 19. (p. 636 b.) Καὶ πομπῆθεν Ἰάκωβος, ὁ πρῶτος ἐπισκοπεύσας ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις, κ.τ.λ. Hær. 78. Antidicomar. n. 7. (p. 1040 b. c.) Καὶ πρῶτος οὗτος [Ἰάκωβος] εἴληφε τὴν καθέδραν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς, ᾗ πεπίστευκε Κύριος τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς πρώτῳ.

[65] Hom. 38. in 1 Cor. 15. (t. 10 p. 355 d.) Αὐτὸς γὰρ αὐτὸν λέγει κεχειροτονηκέναι καὶ ἐπίσκοπον ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις πεποιηκέναι πρῶτον.

[66] L. 8. c. 35. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 416.) Κἀγὼ Ἰάκωβος, ἀδελφὸς μὲν κατὰ σάρκα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, δοῦλος δὲ ἀ Θεοῦ μονογενοῦς, ἐπίσκοπος δὲ ὑπ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλω Ἱεροσολύμων χειροτονηθεὶς, τάδε φη μί.

[67] L. 2. c. 23. (v. 1. p. 77. 16.) Ἰουδαῖοι γεμὴν, τοῦ Παύλου Καίσαρ ἐπικαλεσαμένου, ἐπί τε τὴν Ῥωμαίω πόλιν ὑπὸ Φήστου παραπεμφθέντο τῆς ἐλπίδος καθ' ἣν ἐξήρτυον αὐτῷ τὴ ἐπιβουλὴν ἀποπεσόντες, ἐπὶ Ἰάκωβο τὸν τοῦ Κυρίου τρέπονται ἀδελφὸν, πρὸς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὁ τῆς ἐπισκοπῆ τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐγκεχείριστ θρόνος.—L. 3. c. 5. (p. 93. 12.) .. Ἰακώβου, τοῦ τὸν αὐτόθι τῆς ἐπισκο πῆς θρόνον πρώτου μετὰ τὴν τοῦ Σω τῆρος ἡμῶν ἀνάληψιν κεκληρωμένο κ.τ.λ.—Ibid. c. 7. (p. 165.) Ἰακωβ

that character, as first bishop of Jerusalem, ordained by the Apostles. So Hegesippus[68], Clemens Alexandrinus[69], and Dionysius[70], bishop of Corinth, all cited by Eusebius; to whom we may add St. Austin[71], who styles John, bishop of Jerusalem, St. James's successor, and possessor of the chair wherein he sat as first bishop of the place. And it is remarkable what Clemens, one of the most ancient of these writers, says, 'that this was designed as a peculiar honour to St. James, in regard that he was the brother of Christ; for though our Saviour usually gave the preference to Peter and John, and James his brother, yet none of those contended about this honour, but chose this James, surnamed Justus, to be bishop of the place; where he lived a saint and died a martyr.'

Some time after his death, as Eusebius[72] relates from ancient tradition, the Apostles and disciples of our Lord, as many as were yet in being, met together with our Saviour's kinsmen,

τε αὐτὸς ὁ τῇδε πρῶτος ἐπίσκοπος, κ. τ. λ.—L. 7. c. 19. (p. 343. 23.) Τὸν γὰρ Ἰακώβου θρόνον τοῦ πρώτου τῆς Ἱεροσολύμων ἐκκλησίας τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν πρὸς αὐτοῦ τοῦ Σωτῆρος καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑποδεξαμένου, κ. τ. λ.

[68] Ap. Euseb. l. 2. c. 23. (v. 1. p. 78. 3.) Διαδέχεται δὲ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν μετὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων ὁ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰάκωβος, κ. τ. λ.

[69] Hypotyp. l. 6. ap. Euseb. l. 2. c. 1. (p. 44. 15.) Κλήμης δὲ ἐν τῷ ἕκτῳ τῶν ὑποτυπώσεων γράφων ὧδε παρίστησι. Πέτρον γάρ, φησι, καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην μετὰ τὴν ἀνάληψιν τοῦ Σωτῆρος, ὡς ἂν καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου προτετιμημένους, μὴ ἐπιδικάζεσθαι δόξης· ἀλλὰ Ἰάκωβον τὸν δίκαιον ἐπίσκοπον Ἱεροσολύμων ἑλέσθαι.

[70] Ep. ad Athen. ap. Euseb. l. 4. c. 23. (p. 185.) Καὶ πρῶτόν γε περὶ Διονυσίου φατέον, κ. τ. λ. [The citation, however, contains no allusion to the episcopate of St. James. See the remarks of Grischovius on a few similarly erroneous references. Ed.]

[71] Cont. Crescon. l. 2. c. 37. (t. 9. p. 434 b.)... Hierosolymitanam [ecclesiam] quam primus apostolus Jacobus episcopatu suo rexit, etc. —Cont. Lit. Petil. l. 2. c. 51. (ibid. p. 254 g.).... Cathedra tibi quid fecit ecclesiæ Romanæ.... vel ecclesiæ Ierosolymitanæ, in qua Jacobus sedit, et in qua hodie Joannes sedet, etc.—Vid. Cyril. H. Catech. 4. n. 17. [al. 28.] (p. 65 d.) Περὶ γὰρ τούτων τῶν βρωμάτων οὐκ ἐμοὶ νῦν μόνον, ἀλλ' ἤδη καὶ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις καὶ Ἰακώβῳ, τῷ ταύτης τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπισκόπῳ, σπουδὴ γέγονε. —Ibid. 14. n. 11. [al. 21.] (p. 216 a.) Ἔπειτα ὤφθη Ἰακώβῳ, τῷ ἑαυτοῦ μὲν ἀδελφῷ, ἐπισκόπῳ δὲ πρώτῳ τῆς παροικίας ταύτης.

[72] L. 3. c. 11. (v. 1. p. 105. 14.) Μετὰ τὴν Ἰακώβου μαρτυρίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτίκα γενομένην ἅλωσιν τῆς Ἱερουσαλὴμ λόγος κατέχει τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν τοῦ Κυρίου μαθητῶν τοὺς εἰσέτι [ἐν] τῷ βίῳ λειπομένους, ἐπὶ ταὐτὸ πανταχόθεν συνελθεῖν, ἅμα τοῖς πρὸς γένους κατὰ σάρκα τοῦ Κυρίου· πλείους γὰρ καὶ τούτων περιῆσαν εἰσέτι τότε τῷ βίῳ· βουλήν τε ὁμοῦ τοὺς πάντας περὶ τοῦ τίνα χρὴ τῆς Ἰακώβου διαδοχῆς ἐπικρῖναι ἄξιον ποιήσασθαι· καὶ δὴ ἀπὸ μιᾶς γνώμης τοὺς πάντας Συμεῶνα τὸν τοῦ Κλωπᾶ, οὗ καὶ ἡ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου μνημονεύει γραφή, τοῦ τῆς αὐτόθι παροικίας θρόνου ἄξιον εἶναι δοκιμάσαι, ἀνεψιόν, ὥς γε φασὶ, γεγονότα τοῦ Σωτῆρος.

several of which were then alive, to consult about choosing a successor in St. James's room; and they unanimously agreed upon Simeon, son of Cleopas, our Saviour's cousin according to the flesh, thinking him the most fit and worthy person to sit upon the episcopal throne. The same is asserted by Eusebius in other places[73], and the author of the Constitutions[74], under the name of Clemens Romanus.

From Jerusalem, if we pass to Antioch, there again we find Euodius first, and after him Ignatius, ordained bishops by the hands of the Apostles. Baronius[75] and some others fancy that they sat both at the same time; the one, as bishop of the Jews, and the other, of the Gentiles. But Eusebius[76] says expressly, that Euodius was the first, and Ignatius the second, after Euodius was dead. And it is agreed by all ancient writers, that they were both consecrated before St. Peter's death. Of Euodius there can be no question made, if it appears that Ignatius was ordained by the Apostles in his room. Now this is most expressly said by Theodoret[77], 'that he received *the gift of the high-priesthood*, ἀρχιερωσύνης χάριν, from the hand of the great Peter.' In like manner, Chrysostom[78] in his encomium

[73] Chron. (Thes. Temp. Amstel. 1658. p. 205.) Ἰουδαῖοι τὸν ἀδελφὸν Κυρίου Ἰάκωβον κτείνουσι· Συμεὼν ὁ τοῦ Κλεόπα τὸν θρόνον Ἱεροσολύμων διαδέχεται. [Conf. ap. Hieron. (t. 8. p. 668. ad calc.) Καὶ παρέλαβε τὸ σχῆμα τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς κ. τ. λ. Ed.]

[74] L. 7. c. 46. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 382.) Περὶ δὲ τῶν ὑφ' ἡμῶν χειροτονηθέντων ἐπισκόπων ἐν τῇ ζωῇ τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ, γνωρίζομεν ὑμῖν, ὅτι εἰσὶν οὗτοι· Ἱεροσολύμων μὲν Ἰάκωβος, ὁ τοῦ Κυρίου ἀδελφός· οὗ τελευτήσαντος, δεύτερος Συμεὼν ὁ τοῦ Κλεόπα, κ. τ. λ.

[75] An. 45. n. 14. (t. 1. p. 343 d.) Cum dissensio illa inter fideles, qui ex circumcisione, et eos qui ex gentibus ad fidem venerant, esset concitata: quocirca quamdiu illa perduravit, illud remedium fuisse adhibitum, ut uterque sederet, alterque eorum præesset iis, qui ex circumcisione, alter vero iis, qui ex gentibus ad ecclesiam venissent.—An. 71. n. 11. (ibid. p. 683 a.) Hoc eodem anno, Olympiade ducentesima duodecima, anno primo (ut numerat Eusebius) Euodio episcopo Antiocheno ex hac vita sublato, subrogatur qui aliquando collega sedisset Ignatius.

[76] L. 3. c. 22. (v. 1. p. 112. 3.) Ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἐπ' Ἀντιοχείας Εὐοδίου πρώτου καταστάντος, δεύτερος ἐν τοῖς δηλουμένοις Ἰγνάτιος ἐγνωρίζετο.

[77] Dial. 1. t. 5. p. 33. (t. 4. part. 1. p. 49.) Ἀκήκοας δὲ πάντως Ἰγνάτιον ἐκεῖνον, ὃς διὰ τῆς τοῦ μεγάλου Πέτρου δεξιᾶς τῆς ἀρχιεροσύνης τὴν χάριν ἐδέξατο, καὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν Ἀντιόχεων ἰθύνας τὸν τοῦ μαρτυρίου στέφανον ἐνεδήσατο.

[78] Hom. 42. in Ignat. t. 1. p. 563. (t. 2. p. 597 b.) Οὕτω δὴ καὶ Πέτρου μέλλοντος ἐντεῦθεν ἀποδημεῖν, ἕτερον ἀντίρροπον Πέτρου διδάσκαλον ἡ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἀντεισήγαγε χάρις, ὥστε μὴ τὴν ἤδη γενομένην οἰκοδομὴν τῇ τοῦ διαδεξαμένου εὐτελείᾳ σαθροτέραν γενέσθαι· πέντε μὲν οὖν στεφάνους ἀπηριθμησάμεθα ἀπὸ τοῦ μεγέθους τῆς ἀρχῆς. ἀπὸ τῆς ἀξίας τῶν κεχειροτονηκότων, ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ καιροῦ δυσκολίας, ἀπὸ τοῦ μέτρου τῆς πόλεως, ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς τοῦ παραδόντος αὐτῷ τὴν ἐπισκοπήν.

upon him says, 'he does not only admire him because he was thought worthy of so high a degree, but that he was ordained to it by those holy men, and had the hands of the blessed Apostles laid upon his sacred head.' The same is said in effect by Athanasius[79], when he calls him the first bishop of Antioch after the Apostles; and Origen[80], who calls him the second after St. Peter; and Jerom[81], the third. For though they count differently, yet they mean the same thing; that Ignatius was ordained successor to Euodius while the Apostles lived, and so might be called either second or third after the Apostles, according as St. Peter and Euodius were included or excluded out of the number.

From Antioch let us go to Smyrna, where we shall find Polycarp, another apostolical bishop, ordained by the Apostles. St. Jerom[82] ascribes his ordination to St. John, whose disciple he was. Irenæus[83] says, 'he himself knew him,' and therefore could not mistake in what he relates of him, which is, 'that he was ordained bishop by the Apostles.' Tertullian[84] and Eusebius[85] witness the same; the one saying that he was ordained by St. John, and the other, by those that had seen the Lord.

Papias was another disciple of St. John, as both Irenæus[86]

[79] De Synod. Arim. t. 1. p. 922. (t. 1. part. 2. p. 607 d. n. 47.) Ἰγνάτιος οὖν, ὁ μετὰ τοὺς ἀποστόλους ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ κατασταθεὶς, ἐπίσκοπος καὶ μάρτυς τοῦ Χριστοῦ γενόμενος κ. τ. λ.

[80] Hom. 6. in Luc. (t. 3. p. 938 a.) Ignatium dico episcopum Antiochiæ post Petrum secundum.

[81] De Scriptor. Eccles. in Ignat. [al. c. 16.] (t. 2. p. 841.).... Tertius post Petrum apostolum episcopus.

[82] Ibid. [c. 17.] (p. 843.) Polycarpus Joannis apostoli discipulus, ab eo Smyrnæ episcopus ordinatus.

[83] L. 3. c. 3. (p. 203. 17.) .... Ab apostolis in Asia, in ea quæ est Smyrnis [al. Smyrnæ] ecclesia, constitutus episcopus, quem et nos vidimus in prima nostra ætate.

[84] De Præscript. c. 32. (p. 213 b.) Hoc enim modo ecclesiæ apostolicæ census suos deferunt, sicut Smyrnæorum ecclesia Polycarpum ab Joanne conlocatum refert: sicut Romanorum, &c.

[85] L. 3. c. 36. (v. 1. p. 130. 3.) Διέπρεπε γεμὴν κατὰ τούτους ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀσίας τῶν ἀποστόλων ὁμιλητὴς Πολύκαρπος, τῆς κατὰ Σμύρναν ἐκκλησίας πρὸς τῶν αὐτοπτῶν καὶ ὑπηρετῶν τοῦ Κυρίου τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν ἐγκεχειρισμένος.—L. 4. c. 14. (p. 161. 1.) Καὶ Πολύκαρπος δὲ οὐ μόνον ὑπὸ ἀποστόλων μαθητευθεὶς, καὶ συναναστραφεὶς πολλοῖς τοῖς τὸν Χριστὸν ἑωρακόσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπὸ ἀποστόλων κατασταθεὶς εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐν τῇ ἐν Σμύρνῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐπίσκοπος, ὅν, κ. τ. λ.

[86] L. 5. c. 33. (p. 455. 10.) Papias Joannis auditor, Polycarpi contubernalis.—Vid. Hieron. Ep. 29. ad Theodor. (t. 1. p. 450 a.) Refert Irenæus, vir apostolicorum temporum, et Papiæ auditoris evangelistæ Johannis discipulus, &c.—It. De Scriptor. Eccles. [al. c. 18.] (t. 2. p. 845.) Papias, Joannis auditor.

and St. Jerom witness; and he was cotemporary with Ignatius and Polycarp, and bishop of Hierapolis about the same time, that is, in the beginning of the second century. So that it is probable he was another of those bishops whom St. John ordained in Asia, though we have no express testimony to prove it.

But it is asserted by all ancient writers, that Timothy was ordained bishop of Ephesus by St. Paul. Eusebius[87], Chrysostom[88], Epiphanius[89], Jerom[90], Hilary the deacon[91], and the author of the Passion of Timothy, in Photius[92], unanimously attest it; and Theodoret[93] affirms moreover, 'that he was bishop, under the title of *an apostle*.'

Most of the same authors[94] agree in the same evidence for Titus, that he was made bishop of Crete by St. Paul also: and Chrysostom[95], with Eusebius, seems to give both him and Timothy the power of metropolitans; of which more hereafter.

[87] L. 3. c. 4. (v. 1. p. 91. 13.) Οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ Λοῦκας ἐν ταῖς Πράξεσι τοὺς γνωρίμους αὐτοῦ [Παύλου] καταλέγων, ἐξ ὀνόματος αὐτῶν μνημονεύει· Τιμόθεός γε μὴν τῆς ἐν Ἐφέσῳ παροικίας ἱστορεῖται πρῶτος τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν εἰληχέναι, ὡς καὶ Τίτος τῶν ἐπὶ Κρήτης ἐκκλησιῶν.

[88] Hom. 1. in Phil. (t. 11. p. 195 a.) Διὰ τοῦτο γράφων καὶ Τιμοθέῳ ἔλεγε, Τὴν διακονίαν σου πληροφόρησον, ἐπισκόπῳ ὄντι· ὅτι γὰρ ἐπίσκοπος ἦν, φησὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν, Χεῖρας ταχέως μηδενὶ ἐπιτίθει.

[89] Hær. 75. Aërian. n. 5. (t. 1. p. 909 d.) Καὶ ὅτι μὲν οὐ δύναται ταὐτὸν εἶναι, διδάσκει ὁ θεῖος λόγος τοῦ ἁγίου ἀποστόλου, τίς μέν ἐστιν ἐπίσκοπος, τίς δέ ἐστι πρεσβύτερος, ὡς λέγει Τιμοθέῳ, ἐπισκόπῳ ὄντι, κ. τ. λ.

[90] De Scriptor. Eccles. in Timoth. [al. append. 1. § 8.] (t. 2. 943.) Timotheus, Ephesiorum episcopus, ordinatus a beato Paulo, &c.

[91] Pseudo-Ambr. Præf. in 1 Tim. (t. 2. append. p. 289 a.) Hunc ergo jam creatum episcopum instruit, &c. —In 1 Tim. 3. (ibid. p. 295 a.) .. .. Timotheum presbyterum ordinatum significat, sed quia ante se alterum non habebat, episcopus erat. Unde et quemadmodum episcopum ordinet, ostendit. Neque enim fas erat aut licebat, ut inferior ordinaret majorem. Nemo enim tribuit, quod non accepit.

[92] Cod. 254. (p. 1401. 54.) Ὅτι πρῶτον Τιμόθεον ἡ παροῦσα συγγραφή φησιν Ἐφέσου ἐπισκοπῆσαι.

[93] In 1 Tim. 3. 1. (t. 3. part 1. p. 652.) .... Τὴν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς προσηγορίαν τοῖς πάλαι καλουμένοις ἀποστόλοις ἐπέθεσαν .. οὕτω .. Κρητῶν ὁ Τίτος, καὶ Ἀσιανῶν ὁ Τιμόθεος, ἀπόστολοι.

[94] Euseb. l. c. See n. 87 preceding. — Chrysost. Hom. 1. in Phil. l. c. See n. 88 preceeding: Καὶ πάλιν πρὸς Τίτον γράφων φησὶ, Τούτου χάριν ..... ἃ περὶ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου φησίν.—Hieron., De Scriptor. Eccles. in Tit. (t. 2. p. 945 a.) Titus episcopus Cretæ.—Pseud-Ambros. Præf. in Tit. (t. 2. append. p. 313 a.) Titum apostolus consecravit episcopum.—Theodor. l. c. See n. 89 preceding.

[95] Hom. 1. in Tit. (t. 11. p. 729 b.) Τῶν Παύλῳ συνόντων δόκιμος οὗτος ἦν· εἰ μὴ γὰρ ἦν δόκιμος, οὐκ ἂν οὖν αὐτῷ τὴν νῆσον ὁλόκληρον ἐπέτρεψεν, οὐκ ἂν τὰ ἐλλειφθέντα ἀναπληρῶσαι προσέταξεν· ἵνα γάρ, φησι, τὰ λείποντα ἐπιδιορθώσῃ· οὐκ ἂν τοσούτων ἐπισκόπων κρίσιν ἐπέτρεψεν, εἰ μὴ σφόδρα ἐθάρρει τἀνδρί.—Hom. 15.

Others say, that Dionysius the Areopagite was made first bishop of Athens. Eusebius[96] more than once mentions an epistle of Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, a very ancient writer of the second century, wherein this is expressly asserted. So that he must be ordained, either by St. Paul himself, as Suidas and others[97] think, or by some other Apostle. It is generally agreed, that this Dionysius died some time before St. John, and was succeeded in his bishopric by Publius, and he by Quadratus, whom St. Jerom[98] calls a disciple of the Apostles; which, in all probability, refers to his being tutored by St. John. Now, if Quadratus himself was St. John's disciple, (as he might be, who was bishop in the time of the emperor Hadrian, to whom he presented his Apology,) then there might be three bishops successively at Athens, all trained up by the Apostles, and two of them consecrated by their hands, or at least with their consent and approbation.

I shall end this catalogue of primitive bishops with what Theodoret says of Epaphroditus[99], 'that, as Timothy and Titus were bishops of Ephesus and Crete under the name of *apostles*, so Epaphroditus was bishop of Philippi under the same title,' which was then the common name of all that were properly bishops; of which I say no more in this place, because I give a more particular account of it in the following chapter.

in 1 Tim. (ibid. p. 637 c.) Δῆλον δέ ἐστιν ἐντεῦθεν, ὅτι ἐκκλησίαν λοιπὸν ἦν ἐμπεπιστευμένος ὁ Τιμόθεος, ἢ καὶ ἔθνος ὁλόκληρον τὸ τῆς Ἀσίας· διὸ καὶ περὶ πρεσβυτέρων αὐτῷ διαλέγεται.

[96] L. 3. c. 4. (v. 1. p. 92. 9.) Ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ τὸν Ἀρεωπαγίτην ἐκεῖνον, Διονύσιος ὄνομα αὐτῷ, (ὃν ἐν Πράξεσι κ. τ. λ.) τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις ἐκκλησίας, πρῶτον ἐπίσκοπον, ἀρχαίων τὶς ἕτερος Διονύσιος τῆς Κορινθίων παροικίας ποιμὴν ἱστορεῖ γεγονέναι.—L. 4. c. 23. (p. 184. 19.) Καὶ πρῶτόν γε περὶ Διονυσίου φατέον, ὅτι τε τῆς ἐν Κορίνθῳ παροικίας τὸν τῆς ἐπισκόπης ἐγκεχείριστο θρόνον, κ. τ. λ.

[97] In voce Dionys. (t. 1. p. 744 a.) Διονύσιος ὁ Ἀρεωπαγίτης, ἐπίσκοπος Ἀθηνῶν, ἀνὴρ ἐλλογιμώτατος, καὶ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς παιδείας εἰς ἄκρον ἐληλακὼς, ἀκουστὴς Παύλου πρὸς τὴν τοῦ Χριστιανισμοῦ θρησκείαν, καὶ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ καταστὰς εἰς αὐτὰς Ἀθήνας ἐπίσκοπος.—Conf. Maxim. Prolog. ad Oper. Dionys. (t. 2. Prolegom. p. 10.) .... Καὶ τελεῖται μὲν ἅπαντα τῆς σωτηρίας τὰ δόγματα διὰ Παύλου τοῦ κρατίστου, παιδαγωγεῖται δὲ διδασκαλικῶς ὁ Διονύσιος.

[98] De Scriptor. Eccles. [al. c. 19.] (t. 2. p. 845.) Quadratus apostolorum discipulus, Publio Athenarum episcopo ob Christi fidem martyrio coronato, in locum ejus substituitur.

[99] In 1 Tim. 3, 1. (t. 3. part. 1. p. 652.) Φιλιππησίων ἀπόστολος ὁ Ἐπαφρόδιτος ἦν.

CHAP. II.

Of the several titles of honour given to bishops in the primitive Church.

All bishops at first called *apostles.*

1. For further confirmation of what has been asserted in the foregoing chapter, it will not be amiss here to subjoin next a short account of the several titles of honour which were given to bishops in the primitive Church. The most ancient of these is the title of *apostles;* which, in a large and secondary sense, is thought by many to have been the original name for bishops, before the name *bishop* was appropriated to their order. For at first they suppose the names *bishop* and *presbyter* to have been common names for all of the first and second order; during which time, the appropriate name for bishops, to distinguish them from mere presbyters, was that of *apostles.* Thus Theodoret[1] says expressly, 'the same persons were anciently called promiscuously both bishops and presbyters, whilst those who are now called bishops were called apostles. But shortly after, the name of *apostles* was appropriated to such only as were Apostles indeed; and then the name *bishop* was given to those who before were called *apostles.*' Thus, he says[2], Epaphroditus was the apostle of the Philippians, and Titus the apostle of the Cretians, and Timothy the apostle of the Asiatics. And this he repeats in several other places[3] of his writings.

The author under the name of St. Ambrose[4] asserts the same thing, that all bishops were called *apostles* at first; and therefore he says[5], 'that St. Paul, to distinguish himself from such apostles, calls himself an Apostle not of man, nor sent by man to preach, as those others were, who were chosen and

[1] In 1 Tim. 3, 1. (t. 3. part. 1. p. 652.) .... Τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἐκάλουν ποτὲ πρεσβυτέρους καὶ ἐπισκόπους· τοὺς δὲ νῦν καλουμένους ἐπισκόπους, ἀποστόλους ὠνόμαζον.

[2] In Phil. 1, 1. (ibid. p. 445.) .. .. Τοὺς αὐτοὺς καὶ πρεσβυτέρους καὶ ἐπισκόπους ὠνόμασεν.

[3] In Phil. 2, 25. (ibid. p. 459.) Ἀπόστολον δὲ αὐτὸν κέκληκεν αὐτῶν, ὡς τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν αὐτῶν ἐμπεπιστευμένον· ὡς εἶναι δῆλον ὅτι ὑπὸ τοῦτον ἐτέλουν οἱ ἐν τῷ προοιμίῳ κληθέντες ἐπίσκοποι, τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου δηλονότι τὴν τάξιν πληροῦντες.

[4] Pseud-Ambr. in Eph. 4. 11, 12. (t. 2. append. p. 241 b.) Apostoli episcopi sunt.

[5] In Gal. 1, 1. (ibid. p. 209 e.) *Paulus* .... apostolum se non ab hominibus electum et missum ad prædicandum testatur, sicut erant quidam, qui electi ab apostolis mittebantur ad ecclesias roborandas.

sent by the Apostles to confirm the Churches.' Amalarius[6] cites another passage out of the same author, which speaks more fully to the purpose. 'They,' says he, 'who are now called *bishops* were originally called *apostles*; but the holy Apostles being dead, they, who were ordained after them to govern the Churches, could not arrive to the excellency of those first; nor had they the testimony of miracles, but were in many other respects inferior to them. Therefore they thought it not decent to assume to themselves the name of *apostles;* but dividing the names, they left to presbyters the name of *the presbytery*, and they themselves were called *bishops*.'

This is what those authors infer from the identity of the names *bishop* and *presbyter* in the first age. They do not thence argue, as some who abuse their authority have done since, that therefore bishops and presbyters were all one; but they think that bishops were then distinguished by a more appropriate name, and more expressive of their superiority, which was that of *secondary apostles*.

After that, successors of the Apostles.

2. Afterwards bishops thought it honour enough to be styled *the Apostles' successors*. As Cyprian[7], and Firmilian, and the bishops in the Council of Carthage[8] call themselves and others.

[6] De Offic. Eccles. l. 2. c. 13. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 1. p. 974 d.) Qui nunc episcopi nominantur, illi tunc apostoli dicebantur. Beatis vero apostolis decedentibus, illi qui post illos ordinati sunt, ut præessent ecclesiis, illis primis exæquari non poterant, neque miraculorum testimonium par illis habere, sed et in multis aliis inferiores illis esse videbantur: grave existimaverunt apostolorum sibi vindicare nuncupationem: diviserunt ergo nomina ipsa, et ab eisdem presbyteris presbyterii nomen reliquerunt. Alii vero episcopi sunt nuncupati, hi qui et ordinationis præditi potestate, ita ut plenissime iidem præpositos se ecclesiarum esse cognoscerent.

[The identical words are to be found in the edition of this author, according to the Bibliotheca Magna Paris. 1589. t. 6. p. 939. But Amalarius is omitted in the sixth tome of the Bibliotheca Magna, Paris. 1624. The readings vary in the Maxima, Lugdun. 1677., which I have consulted, but the sense of the passage is not altered. Ed.]

[7] Ep. 69. [al. 66.] ad Florent. (p. 285.) Qui apostolis vicaria ordinatione succedunt.—Ep. 42. [al. 45.] ad Cornel. (p. 232.).... Laborare debemus, ut unitatem a Domino, et per apostolos nobis successoribus traditam, obtinere curemus.—Conf. Firmil. Ep. 55. [al. 75.] ap. Cypr. (p. 324.) Hostes autem unius catholicæ ecclesiæ, in qua nos sumus, ... qui apostolis successimus, &c.

[8] Ap. Cypr. in Suffragio Clari a Mascula. (p. 166.) Manifesta est sententia Domini nostri Jesu Christi, apostolos suos mittentis, et ipsis solis potestatem, a Patre sibi datam, permittentis, quibus nos successimus, &c.

And St. Jerom[9] speaks of them in the same style, saying, 'Wheresoever a bishop is, whether at Rome or Eugubium, at Constantinople or at Rhegium, at Alexandria or at Tanis, they are all of equal merit, their priesthood is the same; they are all *successors to the Apostles*.' And both he and St. Austin[10] draw that of the Psalmist to this sense, "Instead of thy fathers, thou shalt have children, whom thou mayest make princes in all lands." They say 'bishops are the sons of the Apostles, and princes and fathers in the Church.'

Whence every bishop's see called *sedes apostolica*.

3. And hence it was that anciently every bishop's see was dignified with the title of *sedes apostolica, an apostolical see;* which in those days was no peculiar title of the bishop of Rome, but given to all bishops in general, as deriving their original, and counting their succession from the Apostles. 'The Catholic Church,' says St. Austin[11], 'is propagated and diffused over all the world by the apostolical sees, and the succession of bishops in them.' It is plain, this is not spoken only of the bishops of Rome, but all other bishops whatsoever. Sidonius Apollinaris[12] uses the same expression, in speaking of a private French bishop who 'sat five and forty years,' he says, 'in his apostolical see.' And Paulinus[13] makes no more but the usual compliment to Alipius, when he tells him, 'that God had deservedly placed him in an apostolical see with the princes of his people.'

Bishops called *princes of the people*.

4. Where we must also note, that Paulinus speaks in the usual phrase and style of those ancient times, when he calls

[9] Ep. 85. [al. 146.] ad Evagr. [Evang.] (t. 1. p. 1076 d.) Ubicumque fuerit episcopus, sive Romæ, sive Eugubii, sive Constantinopoli, sive Rhegii, sive Alexandriæ, sive Tanis, ejusdem meriti, ejusdem est et sacerdotii.—In Ps. 44, 16. (t. 7. p. 123.) Fuerunt, O ecclesia, apostoli patres tui, quia ipsi te genuerunt: nunc autem quia illi recesserunt a mundo, habes pro his episcopos filios, quia te creati sunt.

[10] In Ps. 44, 17. p. 160. (t. 4. p. 398 a.) .... Pro apostolis filii nati sunt tibi, constituti sunt episcopi .. .. Ipsa ecclesia patres illos appellat, ipsa illos genuit et ipsa illos constituit in sedibus patrum.

[11] Ep. 42. [al. 232.] ad Fratres Madaurens. (t. 2. p. 843 e.) Videtis certe multos præcisos a radice Christianæ societatis, quæ per sedes apostolorum et successiones episcoporum certa per orbem propagatione diffunditur, &c.

[12] L. 6. Ep. 1. ad Lup. Tricassin. (p. 377.) In apostolica sede novem jam decursa quinquennia.

[13] Ep. 45. ad Alyp. (p. 398.) ... Cum principibus populi sui sede apostolica merito collocavit Dominus.—Vid. Tertull. de Præscript. c. 36. (p. 215 a.) .... Percurre ecclesias apostolicas, apud quas ipsæ adhuc cathedræ apostolorum suis locis præsidentur, &c. Proxima est tibi Achaia? Habes Corinthum. Si non longe es a Macedonia, habes Philippos. Si potes in Asiam tendere, habes Ephesum. Si autem Italiæ adjiceris, habes Romanum.

bishops *princes of the people*. For that was another usual title that was given them; as appears from Optatus[14], and several passages in St. Jerom[15], who, to distinguish them from secular princes, usually styles them *principes Ecclesiæ*[16], *princes of the Church;* applying to them that prophecy of Isaiah, lx. 17, which according to his translation is, "I will make thy princes peace, and thy bishops righteousness." Upon which he[17] has this note; 'that the majesty of the Holy Scripture is to be admired, in that it calls those who were to be bishops in future ages by the name of *princes*.' In the Greek writers they are styled *ἄρχοντες ἐκκλησιῶν, governors* and *princes* likewise; as frequently in Eusebius[18], Origen[19], Chrysostom[20], and many others.

[14] L. 1. p. 39. (p. 15.) .... Ipsi apices, et principes omnium episcopi.

[15] In Esai. 3, 14. (t. 4. p. 58 e.) Inter senes et principes hoc fuisse reor in veteri populo, quod nunc est inter presbyteros et episcopos. [Ibid. (p. 59 d.) Sed ad nostros principes referri potest. *Grischov.*]

[16] In Ps. 45, 16. (t. 7. p. 123.)... Principes ecclesiæ, id est episcopi.— In Esai. 5, 11. (t. 4. p. 76 d.) Abutamur hoc testimonio adversum principes ecclesiæ.

[17] In Esai. 60, 17. (ibid. p. 728 e.) Scripturæ sanctæ admiranda majestas, quod principes futuros ecclesiæ episcopos nominavit.

[18] L. 6. c. 28. (v. 1. p. 293. 10.) *Ὃς δὴ [Μαξιμῖνος] κατὰ κότον τὸν πρὸς τὸν Ἀλεξάνδρου οἶκον ἐκ πλειόνων πιστῶν συνεστῶτα, διωγμὸν ἐγείρας, τοὺς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἄρχοντας μόνους, ὡς αἰτίους τῆς κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον διδασκαλίας ἀναιρεῖσθαι προστάττει.*—L. 8. c. 1. (p. 376. 31.) *Ἀρχόντων τε ἄρχουσι προσρηγνύντων, καὶ λαῶν ἐπὶ λαοὺς καταστασιαζόντων.* — Ibid. c. 3. (p. 379. 18.) *Τότε δὴ οὖν πλεῖστοι μὲν ὅσοι τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἄρχοντες, δεινοῖς αἰκίαις προθύμως ἐναθλήσαντες, μεγάλων ἀγώνων ἱστορίας ἐπεδείξαντο, κ.τ.λ.*— De Mart. Palæstin. c. 1. (p. 408. 3.) *Μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως πλεῖστοι ὅσοι τῶν ἐπιχωρίων ἐκκλησιῶν ἄρχοντες, κ. τ. λ.*

[19] Hom. 11. in Jerem. (t. 3. p. 189 d.) *Ὁ δὲ τὴν πάντων ἡμῶν ἐγκεχειρισμένος ἀρχὴν αὐτὴν τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν, ἐπὶ πλεῖον ἀπαιτεῖται.*—Cont. Cels. l. 3. p. 129. (t. 1. p. 466 f.) *Οὕτω δὲ καὶ ἄρχοντα ἐκκλησίας ἑκάστης πόλεως ἄρχοντι τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει συγκριτέον· ἵνα κατανοήσῃς, ὅτι καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν σφόδρα ἀποτυγχανομένων βουλευτῶν καὶ ἀρχόντων ἐκκλησίας Θεοῦ, καὶ ῥαθυμότερον παρὰ τοὺς εὐτονωτέρως βιοῦντας, οὐδὲν ἧττόν ἐστιν εὑρεῖν ὡς ἐπίπαν ὑπεροχὴν, τὴν ἐν τῇ ἐπὶ τὰς ἀρετὰς προκοπῇ, παρὰ τὰ ἤθη τῶν ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι βουλευόντων καὶ ἀρχόντων.*

[20] De Sacerdot. l. 3. c. 14. (t. 2. p. 390 d.) *Πέφυκε γὰρ ὡς τὰ πολλὰ, τὸ τῶν ἀρχομένων πλῆθος, ὥσπερ εἰς ἀρχέτυπόν τινα εἰκόνα, τοὺς τῶν ἀρχόντων τρόπους ὁρᾷν, καὶ πρὸς ἐκείνους ἐξομοιοῦν ἑαυτούς.* [Conf. Suicer. in voce, *Ἄρχων.* (t. 1. p. 540.) Concerning the passage as cited from Chrysostom, the lexicographer observes, —'Loquitur autem, ut ex tota serie manifestum est, de pastoribus et eorum auditoribus.' Ed.] Ibid. c. 15. (p. 392 e.) .... *Ἴθι δὴ, καὶ διάκυψον εἰς τὰς δημοτελεῖς ἑορτὰς, ἐν αἷς μάλιστα τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἀρχῶν τὰς αἱρέσεις ποιεῖσθαι νόμος.* — Hom. 3. ad Pop. Antioch. (t. 2. p. 35 c. d.) .... *Ἰακὼβ θρεμμάτων προεστὼς .... πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἡμᾶς τοὺς οὐκ ἀλόγοις ἐφεστῶτας, ἀλλὰ πνευματικοῖς προβάτοις, κ. τ. λ.*

Præpositi, προεστῶτες, πρόεδροι, ἔφοροι.

5. In the same sense, Cyprian[21] and Tertullian[22] commonly call them *presidents*, or *provosts of the Church;* which Eusebius[23] and Justin Martyr[24] call *προεστῶτες*, and sometimes *πρόεδροι*[25], and others[26] *ἔφοροι*, *inspectors*. All which are proper characters of bishops, who have the care, presidency, and inspection of the Church.

Principes sacerdotum, pontifices maximi, summi sacerdotes, &c.

6. And because this presidency was not only over the people, but also over the clergy, they were dignified upon that account with the distinguishing characters of *summi sacerdotes, pontifices maximi*, and *principes sacerdotum, chief priests*, and *princes of the clergy*. The author, under the name of St. Am-

[21] Ep. 3. [al. 8.] (p. 180.) ... Qui videmur præpositi esse, etc.—Ep. 4. [al. 9.] (p. 182.) Quod et vobis esset circa præpositi memoriam gloriosum.—Ep. 10. [al. 16.] (p. 194.)... Neque nunc sibi præpositum episcopum cogitantes.—Ep. 14. [al. 19.] (p. 198.)... Ut præpositi cum clero convenientes, etc.—Ep. 27. [al. 33.] (p. 216.)... Omnis actus ecclesiæ per eosdem præpositos gubernetur.—Ep. 81. [al. 72.] (p. 306.).. Cum habeat in ecclesiæ administratione voluntatis suæ arbitrium liberum unusquisque præpositus, etc.

[22] Apol. c. 39. (p. 31 a.) Præsident probati quique seniores, honorem istum non pretio, sed testimonio adepti.—Ad Uxor. l. 1. c. 7. (p. 165 c.) Quantum detrahant, quantum obstrepant sanctitati nuptiæ secundæ, disciplinæ ecclesiæ, præscriptio apostoli declarat, cum digamos non sinit præsidere, etc.—De Cor. Mil. c. 3. (p. 102 a.) Eucharistiæ sacramentum, et in tempore victus, et omnibus mandatum a Domino, etiam antelucanis cœtibus, nec de aliorum manu quam præsidentium sumimus.

[23] L. 6. c. 3. (v. 1. p. 261. 14.) Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἑώρα φοιτητὰς ἤδη πλείους προσιόντας, αὐτῷ μόνῳ τῆς τοῦ κατηχεῖν διατριβῆς ὑπὸ Δημητρίου τοῦ τῆς ἐκκλησίας προεστῶτος ἐπιτετραμμένης, κ. τ. λ.—Ibid. c. 8. (p. 265. 7.) Γνοὺς δῆτα ὕστερον ὁ Δημήτριος, ἅτε τῆς αὐτόθι παροικίας προεστὼς εὖ μάλα μὲν αὐτὸν ἀποθαυμάζει τοῦ τολμήματος, κ. τ. λ.—Ibid. c. 10. (p. 268. 4.) Δόξαν τοῖς τῶν ὁμόρων ἐκκλησιῶν προεστῶσιν, κ. τ. λ.—L. 7. c. 13. (p. 339. 35.) .. Σωφρονέστερον περὶ τῷ ἀρχὴν διατίθεται [Γαλλιηνὸς] ἀνίησί τε αὐτίκα διὰ προγραμμάτων τὸν καθ' ἡμῶν διωγμὸν, ἐπ' ἐλευθερίας τοῖς τοῦ λόγου προεστῶσι τὰ ἐξ ἔθους ἐπιτελεῖν δι' ἀντιγραφῆς προστάξας, κ. τ. λ. —L. 8. c. 6. (p. 383. 9.) Τοὺς πανταχόσε τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν προεστῶτας εἱρκταῖς καὶ δεσμοῖς ἐνεῖραι πρόσταγμα ἐφοίτα βασιλικόν.

[24] Apol. 2. (p. 97 c.) Ἔπειτα προσφέρεται τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἄρτος, καὶ ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ κράματος.—Conf. Chrysost. Hom. 3. in loc. (t. 11. p. 349 d.).. Ἕως ἂν τὴν προεδρίαν ἔχωμεν, κ. τ. λ. [It. Greg. Nyss. de Scop. Christ. (t. 306 a. b.) Χρὴ δὲ τοὺς προεστῶτας τοῦ πνευματικοῦ τούτου χόρου, κ. τ. λ. .... Οὕτως οὖν χρὴ τοὺς προεστῶτας ἐπιμελεῖσθαι τῶν ἀδελφῶν. *Grischov.*]

[25] Euseb. l. 8. c. 2. (v. 1. p. 379. 10.).. Ἑτέρων ἐπιφοιτησάντων γραμμάτων, προσετάττετο τοὺς μὲν ἐκκλησιῶν προέδρους πάντας τοὺς κατὰ πάντα τόπον πρῶτα μὲν δεσμοῖς παραδίδοσθαι· εἶθ' ὕστερον πάσῃ μηχανῇ θύειν ἐξαναγκάζεσθαι.—De Mart. Palæstin. c. 2. (p. 411. 9.) Ταῦτα μὲν ἔτει πρώτῳ τοῦτον ἀπετελέσθη τὸν τρόπον· κατὰ μόνων τῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας προέδρων ἐπηρτημένου τοῦ διωγμοῦ.

[26] Philostorg. l. 3. n. 4. (v. 3. p. 487. 18.) Τὴν δὲ πρεσβείαν ὑπελθόντα καὶ ἐφόρου λαβεῖν παρὰ τῶν ὁμοδόξων ἀξίωμα. [Ibid. n. 15. (p. 496. 23.) Καὶ Παυλίνου μὲν ἀκροάσασθαι πρότερον, ὃς ἐκ τῆς ἐφορείας Τύρου εἰς τὴν τῆς Ἀντιοχείας κατέστη. *Grisch.*]

brose[27], gives the bishop expressly the title of *chief priest*, and *prince of the priests*. And so frequently the name, *summus sacerdos*, is used by St. Jerom; as, where speaking of himself, he says[28], 'in the opinion of all men, he was thought worthy of the high priesthood,' he explains himself to mean a bishopric; and in another place[29], 'the prosperity of the Church depends upon the honour of the chief priest.' The same title is given to all bishops by the author of the Questions upon the Old and New Testament[30] under the name of St. Austin. Sidonius[31] calls them *summi pontifices*, where he speaks only of the bishops of France. And therefore when Tertullian[32] gives the title of *pontifex maximus* to the bishop of Rome, he does him no greater honour than in those days was done to every bishop in the world; and some think he meant not the bishop of Rome in particular, but comprehended all others under that title. As it is certain the Council of Agde does[33], when it orders every metropolitan to call his suffragans *ad ordinationem summi pontificis;* which means not, to the ordination of the pope of Rome, but to the ordination of any French bishop within the metropolitan's province or jurisdiction. For then, as we have seen, *summus pontifex* was the ordinary title of every bishop whatsoever.

7. And so was the name *papa*, though now it is become the pretended prerogative and sole privilege of the bishop of Rome. Eve sho

[27] Pseud-Ambros. in Eph. 4. v. 11, 12. (t. 2. append. p. 241 d.) In episcopo omnes ordines sunt, quia primus sacerdos est, hoc est, princeps est sacerdotum.

[28] Ep. 99. [al. 45.] ad Asell. (t. 1. p. 194 c.) Omnium pene judicio dignus summo sacerdotio decernebar.

[29] Dial. cont. Lucifer. p. 139. (t. 2. p. 182 a.) Ecclesiæ salus in summi sacerdotis dignitate pendet.

[30] Quæst. 101. (int. Oper. August. t. 3. append. p. 93 a.) Quid est enim episcopus nisi primus presbyter, id est, summus sacerdos.

[31] L. 4. Ep. 11. (p. 261.) Nam de pontificis tenore summi, Ille insignia sumpsit, hic laborem.—L. 7. Ep. 5. (p. 425.) Bituricas decreto civium petitus adveni. Caussa fuit evocationis titubans ecclesiæ status; quæ nuper summo viduata pontifice etc.

[32] De Pudicit. c. 1. (p. 555 a.) Audio enim edictum esse propositum, et quidem peremptorium. Pontifex scilicet maximus, quod est, episcopus episcoporum dicit [al. edicit]; Ego et mœchiæ et fornicationis delicta pœnitentia defunctis [al. functis] dimitto. [Compare what the author says just afterwards, sect. 8. p. 68, implying that Tertullian gives this title to the bishop of Rome ironically. See also the latter part of n. 51. Ed.]

[33] C. 35. (t. 4. p. 1389 b.) Si metropolitanus episcopus ad comprovinciales epistolas direxerit, in quibus eos aut ad ordinationem summi pontificis, aut ad synodum invitet, etc.

ly call- pa, r, or

Some historians[34] indeed are so vain as to assert confidently, that Cyril of Alexandria was the first bishop in those parts who had the honour of being called *papa*, and that because he was pope Celestine's legate in the Council of Ephesus. The Arabic writers, Homaidius and Abubacrus Habasides, cited by Echellensis and bishop Pearson[35], deliver a quite contrary story; 'that the name was first given to the patriarch of Alexandria, and thence carried to Rome;' which seems to be said in answer to the Romish pretences. But the truth of the matter is, that it was no peculiar privilege of one patriarch or other, but the common title of all bishops who were called *fathers of the Church*[36], and *fathers of the clergy*[37]; and *papa* means no more. Therefore Tertullian, in his book *De Pudicitia*[38], speaking indefinitely of any Christian bishop who absolves penitents, gives him the name of *Benedictus Papa*. Or, if we suppose, as some do, that he speaks particularly of the bishop of Rome, yet there is nothing singular in it; for at the same time, Dionysius, presbyter of Alexandria, speaking of Heraclas, his bishop, gives him the very same title[39], 'the blessed pope Heraclas.' And Arius himself, in one of his Epistles[40], speaks of his bishop Alexander in the same style. St. Jerom[41] gives the title to Athanasius, Epiphanius, and Paulinus; and writing often to St. Austin, he always inscribes his Epistles[42], *Beatis-*

[34] Nicephorus is cited and chastized by Savaro for this. Vid. Not. in Sidon. Apollin. l. 6. Ep. 1. [p. 379.] Neque vero Cyrillus papa vocatur ex privilegio Cœlestini papæ, etc.

[35] Vind. Ignat. part. 1. c. 11. (Cotel. v. 2. p. 330.) Arabes enim putabant, etc.

[36] August. in Ps. 44. p. 169. See before, p. 62. n. 10.

[37] Hieron. Ep. 62. [al. 82.] ad Theophil. (t. 1. p. 517 c.) .... Sed episcopi contenti sint honore suo. Patres se sciant esse, non dominos. —Conf. Ep. 2. [al. 52.] ad Nepot. (ibid. p. 260 c.) Illud etiam dico quod episcopi sacerdotes se esse noverint non dominos, etc.—Ep. 3. [al. 60.] ad Heliodor. (ibid. p. 334 a.) Quanto magis tu et avunculus et episcopus, hoc est, et in carne et in spiritu pater.—Comment. in Ps. 44, 16. (t. 7. p. 123.) Sunt enim et hi [episcopi] patres tui, etc.

[38] C. 13. (p. 564 c.) ..... Bonus pastor et benedictus papa concionans, etc.

[39] Ep. ad Philem. ap. Euseb. l. 7. c. 7. (v. 1. p. 327. 5.) Παρὰ τοῦ μακαρίου πάπα ἡμῶν Ἡρακλᾶ.

[40] Ep. ad Euseb. Nicomed. ap. Theodor. l. 1. c. 5. (v. 3. p. 22. 10.) See the following citation.—Conf. Epiph. Hær. 69. Arian. n. 6. (t. 1. p. 731.) Κυρίῳ ποθεινοτάτῳ ἀνθρώπῳ, Θεοῦ πιστῷ, ὀρθοδόξῳ Εὐσεβίῳ, Ἄρειος ὁ διωκόμενος ὑπὸ Ἀλεξάνδρου πάπα ἀδίκως διὰ τὴν πάντα νικῶσαν ἀλήθειαν.

[41] Ep. 61. ad Pammach. [al. Lib. cont. Joan. Hierosol. c. 4.] (t. 2. p. 411 b.) Habes papam Epiphanium.—Ibid. (c.) Excepto papa Athanasio et Paulino.

[42] Epp. 17. 18. 25. 30. int. Epp. August. (int. Epp. Hieron. 101, 102,

simo Papæ Augustino. So among Cyprian's Epistles[43], those that are written to him are usually inscribed in the same manner, *Cypriano Papæ.* And the clergy of Rome themselves[44] give him the title of *Benedictus Papa*, and *Beatissimus* and *Gloriosissimus Papa Cyprianus.* It were easy to add many other testimonies out of Epiphanius, and Constantine's Epistles, and the Theodosian Code, and especially Sidonius Apollinaris[45], who always gives the French bishops the style of *Dominus Papa.* But in so plain a case I need not insist any longer, especially since a learned Romanist[46] has undertaken to prove, out of authors as late as Photius and Gregory of Tours, that *papa* was the common name of all bishops for several ages: who also notes out of Balsamon, that this name was sometimes given to the inferior clergy, who were called *papæ pisinni, little fathers;* and their tonsure or crown thence called *παπαλήτρα, the tonsure of the fathers.* In comparison of whom, Balsamon[47] calls presbyters and the chorepiscopi, *protopapæ* and *protopapades, chief fathers,* speaking in the language of his own times, when the chorepiscopi and presbyters were become all one.

8. But bishops had still a more honourable title than that of *papa;* for they were commonly called *patres patrum,* and *episcopi episcoporum, fathers of fathers,* and *bishops of bishops.* The first that had this title was James, bishop of Jerusalem, which made the counterfeit author, under the name of Clemens Romanus[48], inscribe an Epistle (as directed to him) *Patres patrum, episcopi episcoporum.*

103, 104. t. 1. pp. 625 seqq.) Domino vere sancto et beatissimo papæ Augustino, &c.

[43] Ep. 23. al. 30. [al. 36.] (p. 218.) Cypriano papæ, presbyteri et diaconi Romæ consistentes, salutem.—Ep. 26. [al. 31.] (p. 212) Cypriano papæ, Moyses et Maximus presbyteri, &c.

[44] Ep. 8. [al. 3.] Cler. Rom. ad Cler. Carth. ibid. (p. 179.) Didicimus secessisse benedictum papam Cyprianum, &c.—Ep. 30. [al. 31.] Cler. Rom. ad Cypr. (p. 212.) .. Beatissime ac gloriosissime papa, ..

[45] L. 6. Ep. 1. (p. 377.) Domino papæ Lupo.—Ibid. Ep. 2. (p. 383.) Papæ Pragmatio.—Ep. 3. (p. 385.) Domino papæ Leontio.—and so for twelve Epistles together.

[46] Savaro in Sidon. l. 6. Ep. 1. (pp. 378, 379.) Papæ] Episcopo, nomen in ea significatione veteribus usitatissimum .... Neque soli episcopi papæ vocabantur, sed etiam omnes clerici.

[47] Comment. in Can. Apost. 59. (p. 264 a.) *Θεμάτισον γὰρ ἐγκρατῆ τὸν πρεσβύτερον εἶναι πραγμάτων ἐκκλησιαστικῶν, τυχὸν χωρεπίσκοπον προβληθέντα, ἢ προτοπάπαν, κ. τ. λ.*—In C. Antioch. c. 10. (p. 817 b.) *Πρεσβυτέρους ἢ πρωτοπάπαδας καὶ χωρεπισκόπους, κ. τ. λ.*

[48] Ep. 1. ad Jacob. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 605.) *Κλήμης Ἰακώβῳ, τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ ἐπισκόπων ἐπισκόπῳ, κ. τ. λ.*

with this title, *Clemens Jacobo Domino, episcopo episcoporum,* &c. To which Sidonius Apollinaris[49] alludes plainly, when writing to Lupus, an eminent French bishop, he tells him, 'he was father of fathers, and bishop of bishops, and another James of his age.' By this we understand what Tertullian[50] means, when speaking ironically of the catholic bishops, who admitted adulterers into communion again upon their repentance, he says, 'I hear there is a decree published, and that a peremptory one; the chief pontiff, the bishop of bishops, saith, "I forgive the sins of adultery and fornication to all those that repent of them."' Some[51] take this for a peculiar character of the bishop of Rome; and I will not deny, but that Tertullian might intend more especially to reflect upon him. But yet there is nothing singular in the title, which did not belong to other bishops as well as to him, as appears from what has been already cited out of Sidonius. To which we may add the testimony of Athanasius[52], who styles Hosius *the father of bishops;* and Gregory Nazianzen[53] gives the same title to his own father as St. Jerom[54] does to Epiphanius, styling him *the father of all bishops.* Cotelerius[55] observes, that Gregory Nyssen is called *πατὴρ πατέρων, father of fathers,* by the second Council of Nice; and others[56] say, Theodosius the

[49] L. 6. Ep. 1. (p. 377.) Tu pater patrum, et episcopus episcoporum, et alter sæculi tui Jacobus.

[50] De Pudicit. c. 1. See before sect. 6. p. 65. n. 32.

[51] An. 142. n. 4. (t. 2. p. 104 e.) In ipsam ecclesiam Romanam insaniens, eam dente canino dilacerat Tertullianus, recitans et impugnans Victoris Romani pontificis edicti verba, ait: Audio etiam edictum propositum, &c. — An. 216. n. 4. (ibid. p. 321 c.) Mox adversus Romanum pontificem, quasi pudicitiæ refragatorem et adversarium, eo quod mœchis et fornicariis pœnitentibus veniam spopondisset, stilum procaciter acuens, ait: Audio etiam, &c. — Conf. Georg. Ambian. Observ. in Tertul. vel Tertul. Rediviv. (t. 3. p. 633 c.) .... Nec serio, ut opinor, dictum, &c.

[52] Ep. ad Solitar. Vit. Agent. (t. 1. part. 1. p. 294 d. n. 46.) .... Ὅτε Λιβέριος ἐπίσκοπος Ῥώμης ἐξωρίσθη, καὶ ὁ πατὴρ τῶν ἐπισκόπων ὁ μέγας Ὅσιος. [Conf. Ad Imp. Constant. Apol. n. 27. Ibid. p. 247 d. Ed.]

[53] Orat. 19. De Fun. Patr. (t. 1. p. 314 d.) .... Πάντας ἀρχιερέας ὧν ἐκλήθης πατήρ.

[54] Ep. 61. [al. L. cont. Joan. Hierosol. c. 12.] (t. 2. p. 419 b.) Licet ipse nominis tui extenues dignitatem, quum patrem pene omnium episcoporum et antiquæ reliquias sanctitatis et opere et sermone despicias.

[55] In Ep. Clem. Rom. (v. 1. p. 605. n. 8.) .... Auctori Quæstionum ad orthodoxos apud Justinum, c. 119. Paulus πατέρων πατὴρ, ut Gregorius Nyssenus Concilio Niceno II. Actione 6. et Clemens noster Anastasio Sinaitæ, Quæst. 96. p. 526. dicitur.

[56] Niceph. l. 14. c. 43. (t. 2. p. 537 c. 3.) Ἀλλὰ σύ γε πάτερ πατέρων ἀληθῶς τιμιώτατε, κ. τ. λ.

emperor gave Chrysostom the same honourable title after death. As to the reason of these names, it is probable some bishops might have them upon the account of personal merit, and others from the eminency of their sees; as the bishop of Alexandria, to whom Balsamon[57] gives the title of *pater patrum* many ages after. But there was a more general reason why all bishops should be called so, as may be collected from Epiphanius, who says[58], 'that the order of bishops was an order that begat fathers to the Church;' that is, bishops made bishops by ordination; whereas presbyters could only beget sons, by the power which they had of baptizing. And therefore, though we sometimes find presbyters called *fathers*, yet we nowhere find the title of *pater patrum* given to any of their order. Yet I must here also observe, that several of these titles were never kindly received among the African fathers; because the bishops of Rome began to abuse them, to establish an usurped authority over their neighbours. Therefore, in two African councils held at Carthage, the one under Cyprian[59], the other[60] in St. Austin's time, these titles, *episcopus episcoporum*, *princeps sacerdotum*, and *summus sacerdos*, were discountenanced and forbidden, insomuch that the primates themselves were not allowed to use them. But of this more hereafter, when we come to speak of metropolitans.

Bishop sometimes called *patriarch*

9. Gregory Nazianzen, in his rhetorical way, usually gives bishops the title of *patriarchs;* by which, he means not patriarchs in the proper sense, as the word came afterward to be used in the Church, to signify bishops of the larger sees, who had primates and metropolitans under them, but any bishops whatsoever, that were heads of their own family; that is, the Church subject to them. Thus he styles his own father *patriarch*[61], though he was but bishop of Nazianzum, a very

[57] Respons. ad Interrog. Marci, ap. Leunclav. Jus Gr. Rom. t. 1. l. 5. p. 362. (p. 362.) Κύριος Μάρκος πατέρων πατὴρ ὑπάρχων.

[58] Hær. 75. Aërian. n. 4. (t. 1. p. 908 a.) Καὶ πῶς ἔστι τοῦτο δύνατον; ἡ μὲν γάρ ἐστι πατέρων γεννητικὴ τάξις· πατέρας γὰρ γεννᾷ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ. ἡ δὲ πατέρας μὴ δυναμένη γεννᾷν διὰ τῆς τοῦ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας τέκνα γεννᾷ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, οὐ μὴν πατέρας, ἢ διδασκάλους.

[59] Ap. Cypr. p. 229. (p. 158.) Neque enim quisquam nostrum episcopum se episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem collegas suos adigit.

[60] Carth. 3. c. 26. (CC. t. 2. p. 1171 b.) Ut primæ sedis episcopus non appelletur princeps sacerdotum, aut summus sacerdos, aut aliquid hujusmodi, sed tantum primæ sedis episcopus.

[61] Orat. 19. (t. 1. p. 312 b.) .....

small city in Cappadocia, under Cæsarea, the metropolis. And in his oration before the Council of Constantinople[62], he gives the same title to all other bishops, complaining of the Arian cruelties against them. 'Have we not had,' says he, 'our ancient bishops, or to speak more properly our *patriarchs*, publicly murdered by them?' In another place[63], complaining of the corrupt promotions and practices of some bishops of his age, he thus takes his leave of them; '*Valete, insolentes esto, patriarchatus per sortes inter vos distribuite*,—Farewell, go on in your insolence, divide the patriarchal dignities among you, translate yourselves from see to see, set up some, pull down others.' Where it is evident he speaks not of *patriarchs*, properly so called, but only of some ambitious spirits among the bishops, who turned all things into confusion, and did what they pleased with the preferments of the Church. Gregory Nyssen uses the same term for bishops, in his Funeral Oration upon Meletius[64], which he made in the Council of Constantinople, where he gives all the bishops then in council the title of *patriarchs*. 'Behold these patriarchs; all these are the sons of our Jacob;' meaning Meletius, whom he calls *Jacob*, for his age, and the rest *patriarchs*, in allusion to the twelve Patriarchs, who were Jacob's children. Thus bishops were commonly styled, till such times as the name *patriarch* became the appropriate title of the most eminent bishops, such as Rome, Constantinople, &c. And even some ages after that. De Marca[65] observes, that Athalaricus and the rest of the Gothish kings in Italy gave the name of *patriarchs* to all bishops within their dominions.

rs 10. It must not here be forgotten, that all bishops anciently were styled also *vicars of Christ*, and had as much interest in

Ἐχρῶντο πατριάρχῃ καὶ νομοθέτῃ καὶ δικαστῇ.—Orat. 41. In Pasch. (ibid. 675 b.) .... Ὁ σεμνὸς Ἀβραὰμ οὗτος ὁ πατριάρχης, ἡ τιμία κεφαλή.—Orat. 20. De Laud. Basil. (ibid. p. 342 d.) .... Τὸν νέον Ἀβραὰμ καὶ πατριάρχην ἡμέτερον, τὸν ἐμὸν πατέρα.

[62] Orat. 22. (ibid. p. 525 c.) Οὐ πρεσβυτέρων, ἐπισκόπων, οἰκειότερον δὲ πατριαρχῶν εἰπεῖν, σφαγὰς δημοσίας [πεπόνθαμεν];

[63] Cygn. Carm. de Episc. (t. 2. p. 308 a.)

[64] Orat. de Funer. Melet. (t. 3. p. 589 b.) Ὁρᾶτε τοὺς πατριάρχας τούτους· πάντες οὗτοι τέκνα τοῦ ἡμετέρου εἰσὶν Ἰακώβ.

[65] Dissert. de Primatib. n. 20. p. 112. (Ad calc. p. 21.) Dictus vero est patriarcha [episcopus Aquileiensis] eo quod reges Gothorum Italici regni episcopos patriarcharum nomine ornarent, quemadmodum testatur Epistola Athalarici regis ad Joannem papam apud Cassiodorum, l. 9. Epistolarum.

that name as he that has since laid so much claim to the title. The author of the Questions[66], under the name of St. Austin, says expressly, 'that every bishop is the vicar of God.' Cyprian says the same in several of his Epistles[67], 'that every bishop is *vice Christi*, *Christ's vicar* or *vicegerent*.' And this is his meaning in that noted passage to Cornelius[68], where he says, 'All heresies and schisms take their original from hence; that men do not submit to God's priest, and consider that there ought to be but one bishop in a church at a time, and one judge as the vicar of Christ.' This is spoken of every individual bishop throughout the world, as Rigaltius[69] freely owns; and they grossly mistake Cyprian's meaning, and abuse his authority, who apply it only to the bishop of Rome. St. Basil[70] extends the title to all bishops; and so does the author under the name of St. Ambrose[71], who is supposed to be Hilary, a deacon of the Church of Rome; which would have been an unpardonable oversight in him, had it not been then the custom of the world to give all others this title, as well as the bishop of Rome.

And angels of Church

11. I shall but take notice of one title more given to bishops, which is that of *angels of the Churches;* a name, which some authors[72] suppose to be used by St. Paul, 1 Cor. xi. 10, where he says, "women ought to be covered in the Church, because of the angels," that is, *bishops*, says Hilary the deacon, in the place last mentioned. And so the same author[73] understands

[66] Quæst. 127. (int. Oper. August. t. 3. append. p. 142 d.) Quanto magis in Dei causis? Ac per hoc antistitem ejus puriorem cæteris esse oportet: ipsius enim personam habere videtur, est enim vicarius ejus.

[67] Cypr. Ep. 63. ad Cæcil. (p. 277. corrige 281.) Ille sacerdos vice Christi vere fungitur, qui id, quod Christus fecit, imitatur.

[68] Ep. 55. [al. 59.] ad Cornel. (p. 261.) Neque enim aliunde hæreses obortæ sunt, aut nata sunt schismata, quam inde quod sacerdoti Dei non obtemperatur, nec unus in ecclesia ad tempus sacerdos, et ad tempus judex vice Christi cogitatur.

[69] In loc. (Prior. p. 80. sub fin. n. g. p. 79. Fell. p. 261. sub fin. n. 2.) Ecce autem episcopos ævo jam Cypriani vicarios Christi.

[70] Constit. Monach. c. 22. (t. 2. part. 2. p. 818 a. n. 4.) Ὁ γὰρ καθηγούμενος οὐδὲν ἕτερόν ἐστιν, ἢ ὁ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ὑπέχων [al. ἐπέχων] πρόσωπον.

[71] In 1 Cor. 11, 10. (t. 2. append. p. 148 a.) Episcopus personam habet Christi. Vicarius Domini est, &c. The author of the Constitutions, l. 2. c. 26. (CC. t. 1. p. 264 a.) styles the bishop θεὸν ἐπίγειον.

[72] Id. in 1 Cor. 11, 10. (ibid. p. 147 f.) Angelos episcopos dicit sicut docetur in Apocalypsi Joannis.

[73] [Id. in Rev. 1, 20. [Berengaud. Expos.] (append. p. 504 e.) Septem igitur angelos sectores septem ecclesiarum debemus intelli-

that of St. John, Rev. i. 20, "the seven stars are the angels of the seven churches;" which is also the interpretation of St. Austin[74] and Epiphanius[75], who say, that by *angels* we are not there to understand the celestial angels, as Origen[76] thought, who assigns a guardian angel to every church, but the *bishops* or *governors* of those seven churches. Hence, in after-ages, bishops were called *angels of the churches;* as Socrates[77] terms Serapion, who was bishop of Thmuis, *the angel* of the Church of Thmuis. And the author of the short Notes[78] upon Timothy, under the name of St. Jerom, says of every bishop, that he is *the angel* of God Almighty. In this sense, Dr. Hammond[79] observes out of a Saxon MS., that in our own language, anciently, bishops were called *God's bydels*, that is, *messengers* or *officers*, as he explains it from sir Henry Spelman's Glossary in the word *bedellus*. And thus much of those ancient titles of honour which were given to all bishops indifferently in the primitive Church.

CHAP. III.

Of the offices of bishops as distinct from presbyters.

1. I come now to consider the episcopal office and function itself; where, to do justice to antiquity, it is necessary for me to observe a threefold distinction between bishops and presbyters, in the discharge of ecclesiastical offices. For, 1st, in the common offices, which were ordinarily intrusted in the hands of presbyters, such as preaching, baptizing, administering the

gere, eo quod angelus nuncius interpretatur. Ed.]

[74] Ep. 162. [al. 43. c. 8.] (t. 2. p. 99 a.) .... Divina voce laudatur sub angeli nomine præpositus ecclesiæ. So also Andreas Cæsariens. ἄγγελοι φύλακες. Comment. in Apoc. 1, 20. (Latine ap. Bibl. Max. t. 5. p. 592.) Hos autem angelos custodes .... denominat.

[75] Hær. 25. Nicolait. n. 3. (t. 1. p. 77 d.) Ἰστέον ἐστι ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου ἀποκαλύψεως, ὃς γράφων μιᾷ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἐκ προσώπου Κυρίου, τουτέστι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ τῷ ἐκείσε καταστάθέντι, σὺν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ ἁγίου ἀγγέλου τοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου, φησὶν, κ. τ. λ.

[76] Hom. 20. [corrige, Hom. 14.] in Num. 22. (t. 2. p. 323 d.) .... Angelis opus est qui præsint operibus sanctis, qui æternæ lucis intellectum et occultorum Dei agnitionem ac rerum divinarum scientiam doceant. [Cf. Hom. 20. in Num. 25. (ibid. p. 350 a.).. Unicuique ecclesiæ generaliter angelus præest, &c.]

[77] L. 4. c. 23. (v. 2. p. 241. 37.) Ὁ τῆς Θμυϊτῶν ἐκκλησίας ἄγγελος Σεραπίων.

[78] In 1 Tim. 3. (t. 9. p. 1047 d.) ... Quanto magis sacerdos legem exquiret, quia angelus Dei omnipotentis est.

[79] Annot. on Rev. 1, 20. (v. 3. p. 869.) Thus in a Saxon MS. &c.

eucharist, &c. there was this obvious difference betwixt a bishop and a presbyter; that the one acted by an absolute and independent power,—the other, in dependence upon, and subordination to, his bishop; by whose authority and directions, under God, he was to be governed, and do nothing without his consent, or against it: so that, though there was no difference in the things that were done, yet there was an essential difference in the power of doing them. This is an observation not commonly made; but it is of very great use, both for establishing the just bounds of episcopal and presbyterial power, and clearing the practice of the primitive Church. 2ndly. Some offices were never intrusted in the hands of presbyters; nor allowed, if performed by them; such as the ordination of bishops, presbyters, &c. 3rdly. Bishops always retained the power of calling their presbyters to an account, and censuring them for their misdemeanours in the discharge of their office; which presbyters could not do by their bishop, being always subject and subordinate to him as their superior. These things cleared, and set in a fair light, will give us a just account of the offices of a bishop, as distinct from that of a presbyter, in the primitive Church.

1. In the common offices, which might be performed by both, the bishop acted by an independent power; but presbyters, in dependence upon and subordination to him.

2. First then, we are to observe, that in such ordinary and common offices as might be performed by both, bishops and presbyters acted by a different power; the bishop was the absolute, independent minister of the Church, and did whatever he did by his own authority, solely inherent in himself; but the presbyters were only his assistants, authorized to perform such offices as he intrusted them with, or gave them commission and directions to perform, which they still did by his authority, and in dependence upon and subordination to him as their superior; and might do nothing against his will, or independent of him. This is clear from many passages in Ignatius, Cyprian, and the canons of the ancient Councils, which all agree in this,—that nothing is to be done without the bishop; that is, without his knowledge, without his consent, directions, or approbation. Thus Ignatius, in his Epistle to the Church of Smyrna[80], 'Let no one perform any ecclesiastical office with-

[80] Ep. ad Smyrn. n. 8. (Cotel. v. 2. p. 90.) Μηδεὶς χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τὶ πρασσέτω τῶν ἀνηκόντων εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.

out the bishop;' which he explains, both there and elsewhere[81], to mean, 'without his authority and permission.' So, in the Council of Laodicea[82], it is expressed the same way; 'The presbyters shall do nothing without the consent of the bishop.' The Councils of Arles[83] and Toledo[84] say, 'without his privity or knowledge.' And the Apostolical Canons[85] give a reason for all this;—'Because the bishop is the man to whom the Lord's people are committed; and he must give an account of their souls.'

3. This rule they particularly apply to *the offices of baptism and the Lord's supper.* A presbyter might ordinarily administer both these sacraments; but not against the will of his bishop, or in opposition or contradiction to him, but by his consent and authority, in a due subordination to him as his superior. 'It is not lawful,' says Ignatius[86], 'either to baptize, or celebrate the eucharist, without the bishop; but that which he allows is well-pleasing to God.' He does not say that none but a bishop might administer these sacraments, but that none was to do it without his allowance and approbation. And that is plainly the meaning of Tertullian[87] and St. Jerom[88], when they say 'that presbyters and deacons have no power to baptize without the command and authority of the bishop or chief-priest; and that this is for the honour of the Church, and the preservation of peace and unity.' St. Ambrose[89] asserts the

[81] Ep. ad Polycarp. n. 4. (Cotel. ibid. p. 95.) Μηδὲν ἄνευ γνώμης σου γινέσθω κ. τ. λ.

[82] C. 56. [al. 57.] (t. 1. p. 1505 e.) Τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους μηδὲν πράττειν ἄνευ τῆς γνώμης τοῦ ἐπισκόπου.

[83] Arelat. 1. c. 19. (non liquet.) Ut presbyteri sine conscientia episcoporum nihil faciant.

[84] Tolet. 1. c. 20. (t. 2. p. 1226 e.) Sine conscientia episcopi nihil penitus presbyteri agere præsumant.

[85] C. 38. (Cotel. [c. 32.] v. 1. p. 443.) Οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ οἱ διάκονοι ἄνευ γνώμης τοῦ ἐπισκόπου μηδὲν ἐπιτελείτωσαν· αὐτὸς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ πεπιστευμένος τὸν λαὸν τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ τὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν αὐτῶν λόγον ἀπαιτηθησόμενος.

[86] Ep. ad Smyrn. n. 8. (Cotel. v. 2. p. 90.) Οὐκ ἐξόν ἐστιν χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, οὔτε βαπτίζειν, οὔτε προσφέρειν, οὔτε θυσίαν προσκομίζειν, οὔτε δοχὴν ἐπιτελεῖν. ἀλλ' ὃ ἂν ἐκείνῳ δοκῇ, κατ' εὐαρέστησιν Θεοῦ. [al. οὔτε ἀγάπην ποιεῖν, omitting the other clauses. See Cotel. Not. ad loc. Ed.]

[87] De Bapt. c. 17. (p. 230 c.) Dandi [baptismum] quidem habet jus summus sacerdos, qui est episcopus: dehinc presbyteri, et diaconi; non tamen sine episcopi auctoritate, propter ecclesiæ honorem, quo salvo, salva pax est.

[88] Dial. cont. Lucifer. p. 139. (t. 2. p. 182 a.) Inde venit, ut sine .. jussione episcopi, neque presbyter, neque diaconus, jus habeant baptizandi.

[89] De Sacrament. l. 3. c. 1. (t. 2.

same, 'that though presbyters do baptize, yet they derive their authority from their superior.'

And in the office of preaching

4. The like observation may be made upon *the office of preaching*. This[90] was, in the first place, the bishops' office, which they commonly discharged themselves, especially in the African Churches. Which is the reason we so often meet with the phrase *tractante episcopo, the bishop preaching*, in the writings of St. Cyprian[91]. For then it was so much the office and custom of bishops to preach, that no presbyter was permitted to preach in their presence, till the time of St. Austin, who, whilst he was a presbyter, was authorized by Valerius, his bishop, to preach before him. But that, as Possidius[92], the writer of his Life, observes, was so contrary to the use and custom of the African Churches, that many bishops were highly offended at it, and spake against it; till the consequence proved that such a permission was of good use and service to the Church; and then several other bishops granted their presbyters power and privilege to preach before them. So that it was then a favour for presbyters to preach in the presence of their bishops, and wholly at the bishops' discretion whether they would permit them or not; and when they did preach, it was *potestate accepta, by the power and authority* of the bishops that appointed them. In the Eastern Churches presbyters were more commonly employed to preach, as Possidius[93] observes, when he says, Valerius brought the custom into Afric from their example. And St. Jerom intimates as much, when

p. 362 b.) ... Licet enim presbyteri fecerint, tamen exordium ministerii a summo est sacerdote.

[90] C. Apost. 57. (Cotel. [c. 50.] v. 1. p. 445.) Ἐπίσκοπος ἢ πρεσβύτερος ἀμελῶν τοῦ κλήρου, ἢ τοῦ λαοῦ, καὶ μὴ παιδεύων αὐτοὺς τὴν εὐσέβειαν, ἀφοριζέσθω.

[91] Ep. 52. [al. 55.] (p. 245.) Ego prius legeram, et episcopo tractante cognoveram non sacrificandum idolis, &c.—Ep. 56. [al. 58.] (p. 256.) ... Nec tractantes episcopos audiat. —Pont. in Vit. Cypr. (Vit. p. 11.) O beatum ecclesiæ populum, qui episcopo suo tali, et oculis pariter et sensibus, et quod est amplius publicata voce compassus est; et, sicut ipso tractante semper audierat, Deo judice, coronatus est.

[92] Vit. August. c. 5. (t. 10. append. p. 260 f.) .... Et eidem presbytero potestatem dedit coram se in ecclesia evangelium prædicandi, ac frequentissime tractandi, contra usum quidem ac consuetudinem Africanarum ecclesiarum. Unde etiam ei nonnulli episcopi detrahebant ..... Postea .... bono præcedente exemplo, accepta ab episcopis potestate, presbyteri nonnulli coram episcopis populo [al. populis] tractare cœperunt verbum Dei.

[93] Ibid. Ille, in orientalibus ecclesiis id ex more fieri sciens, obtrectantium non curabat linguas, &c.

he complains[94] of it as 'an ill custom only in some churches, to forbid presbyters to preach.' Chrysostom preached several of his elaborate discourses at Antioch whilst he was but a presbyter; and so did Atticus[95] at Constantinople. And the same is observed to have been granted to the presbyters[96] of Alexandria, and Cæsarea in Cappadocia[97], and Cyprus, and other places. But still it was but a grant of the bishops; and presbyters did it by *their* authority and commission; and whenever bishops saw just reason to forbid them, they had power to limit or withdraw their commission again; as both Socrates[98] and Sozomen[99] testify, who say, that at Alexandria presbyters were forbidden to preach, from the time that Arius raised a disturbance in the Church.

Thus we see what power bishops anciently challenged and exercised over presbyters in the common and ordinary offices of the Church; particularly for preaching, bishops always esteemed it their office, as much as any other. Such a vast difference was there between the practice of the primitive Church and the bishops of Rome in after-ages! 'When,' as Blondel observes out of Surius[1], 'there was a time when the bishops of Rome were not known to preach for five hundred years together; insomuch that when Pius Quintus made a sermon, it was looked upon as a prodigy, and was, indeed, a greater rarity than the *sæculares ludi* were in old Rome.'

[94] Ep. 2. [al. 52.] ad Nepot. (t. 1. p. 260 e.) Pessimæ consuetudinis est in quibusdam ecclesiis tacere presbyteros, et præsentibus episcopis non loqui, &c.

[95] Ap. Socrat. l. 7. c. 2. (v. 2. p. 348. 20.) Καὶ πρότερον μὲν ἡνίκα ἐν τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ ἐτάττετο, ἐκμαθὼν οὓς καὶ ἐπόνει λόγους, ἐπ' ἐκκλησίας ἐδίδασκε.

[96] Ap. Theodor. l. 1. c. 2. [The passage cited relates only to the rise of Arianism; but the historian terms Arius,—τὴν τῶν θείων γραφῶν πεπιστευμένος ἐξήγησιν,—(v. 3. p. 7. 16.) to which the author seems to allude. Ed.]

[97] Ap. Socrat. l. 5. c. 22. (v. 2. p. 297. 15.) .... Ἐν Καισαρείᾳ τῆς Καππαδοκίας καὶ ἐν Κύπρῳ, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ σαββάτου καὶ κυριακῆς, ἀεὶ περὶ ἑσπέραν μετὰ τῆς λυχναψίας οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ ἐπίσκοποι τὰς γραφὰς ἑρμηνεύουσιν.

[98] Ibid. (p. 297. 24.) Πρεσβύτερος ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ οὐ προσομιλεῖ· καὶ τοῦτο ἀρχὴν ἔλαβεν, ἀφ' οὗ Ἄρειος τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐτάραξεν.

[99] L. 7. c. 17. [This citation is erroneous. See rather l. 1. c. 15. (v. 2. p. 33. 16.) Εἶναι γὰρ ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ἔθος, καθάπερ καὶ νῦν ἑνὸς ὄντος τοῦ κατὰ πάντων ἐπισκόπου, πρεσβυτέρους ἰδίᾳ τὰς ἐκκλησίας κατέχειν, κ. τ. λ. Ed.]

[1] Apol. s. 2. Observand. ad n. 21, 18. (p. 58.) .... Inter urbicos pontifices vix unus ab anno Dom. 1000. aliquoties, si Surio singulari testi fides, concionatus Pius V. obstupescentem miraculi novitate Romam perculit.—It. ap. Surium, Comment. Rer. in Orb. Gest.

5. But to return to the bishops of the primitive Church. There were other offices, which they very rarely intrusted in the hands of presbyters; and if ever they granted them commission to perform them, it was only in cases of great necessity. Such were the offices of reconciling penitents, confirmation of neophytes, consecration of churches, virgins, and widows, with some others of the like nature; of which I shall speak nothing more particularly here now, because they will come more properly under consideration in other places. But there was one office which they never intrusted in the hands of presbyters, nor ever gave them any commission to perform; which was, *the office of ordaining the superior clergy, bishops, presbyters, and deacons.* The utmost that presbyters could pretend to in this matter was to lay on their hands, together with the bishop, in the ordination of a presbyter, whilst the bishop, by his prayer, performed the office of consecration. Thus much is allowed them by one of the Councils of Carthage[2], which yet expressly reserves the benediction or ordination prayer to the bishop only. In the ordination of bishops they had no concern at all, which was always performed by a synod of bishops; as shall be showed more particularly when we come to speak of the rites and customs observed in their ordinations. Here, in this place, it will be sufficient to prove, in general, that the power of ordinations was the prerogative of bishops, and that they never communicated this privilege to any presbyters. St. Jerom's[3] testimony is irrefragable evidence in this case; for in the same place, where he sets off the office of presbyters to the best advantage, he still excepts *the power of ordination.* 'What is it,' says he, 'that a bishop does more than a presbyter, setting aside the business of ordination?' St. Chrysostom[4] speaks much after the same manner, where he advances the

2. T and of o tion intr in t han pres

[2] Carth. 4. c. 3. (t. 2. p. 1199 e.) Presbyter cum ordinatur, episcopo eum benedicente, et manum super caput ejus tenente, etiam omnes presbyteri, qui præsentes sunt, manus suas juxta manum episcopi super caput illius teneant.

[3] Ep. 85. [al. 146.] ad Evagr. [Evang.] (t. 1. p. 1076 c.) Quid enim facit excepta ordinatione episcopus, quod presbyter non faciat?

[4] Hom. 11. in 1 Tim. 3, 8. (t. 11. p. 604 d.) ... Οὐ πολὺ τὸ μέσον αὐτῶν [πρεσβυτέρων] καὶ ἐπισκόπων· καὶ γὰρ καὶ αὐτοὶ διδασκαλίαν εἰσὶν ἀναδεδεγμένοι, καὶ προστασίαν τῆς ἐκκλησίας. Καὶ ἃ περὶ ἐπισκόπων εἶπε, ταῦτα καὶ περὶ πρεσβυτέρων ἁρμόττει· τῇ γὰρ χειροτονίᾳ μόνῃ ἀναβεβήκασι, καὶ τούτῳ μόνον δοκοῦσι πλεονεκτεῖν τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους.

power of presbyters to the highest. 'Bishops and presbyters,' says he, 'differ not much from one another; for presbyters are admitted to preach and govern the Church; and the same qualifications that the Apostle requires in bishops are required in presbyters also: for bishops are superior to them only in the power of ordination, and have that one thing more than they.' In another place[5] he proves that Timothy was a bishop, because the Apostle speaks of his power to ordain, bidding him "lay hands suddenly on no man;" and he adds, both there and elsewhere[6], that the presbytery which ordained Timothy was a synod of bishops, 'because mere presbyters had no power to ordain a bishop.' I might here produce all those Canons of the ancient Councils[7] which speak of bishops ordaining, but never of presbyters; which rule was so precisely observed in the primitive Church, that Novatian himself would not presume to break it, but sent for three bishops from the furthest corners of Italy[8], rather than want a canonical number of bishops to ordain him. I only add that observation of Epiphanius[9], grounded upon the general practice of the Church, 'that the

[5] Hom. 1. in Phil. 1. (t. 11. p. 195 a.) ... Καὶ διάκονος ὁ ἐπίσκοπος ἐλέγετο. Διὰ τοῦτο γράφων καὶ Τιμοθέῳ ἔλεγε, Τὴν διακονίαν σου πληροφόρησον, ἐπισκόπῳ ὄντι· ὅτι γὰρ ἐπίσκοπος ἦν, φησὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν, Χείρας ταχέως μηδενὶ ἐπιτίθει. Καὶ πάλιν, Ὁ ἐδόθη σοι μετὰ ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου· οὐκ ἂν δὲ πρεσβύτεροι ἐπίσκοπον ἐχειροτόνησαν.

[6] Hom. 13. in 1 Tim. 4, 14. (t. 11. p. 618 b.) Οὐ περὶ πρεσβυτέρων φησὶν ἐνταῦθα, ἀλλὰ περὶ ἐπισκόπων· οὐ γὰρ δὴ πρεσβύτεροι τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἐχειροτόνουν.

[7] Nic. c. 19. (t. 2. p. 37 e.) .... Ἀναβαπτισθέντες χειροτονείσθωσαν ὑπὸ τοῦ τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπισκόπου.—C. Antioch. c. 9. (ibid. p. 565 c.) ... Ὡς καὶ χειροτονεῖν πρεσβυτέρους καὶ διακόνους.—C. Calced. c. 2. (t. 4. p. 755 b.) Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος .. χειροτονήσῃ ἐπὶ χρήμασιν ἐπίσκοπον, ἢ χωρεπίσκοπον, ἢ πρεσβύτερον, ἢ διάκονον, κ. τ. λ.—C. 6. (ibid. p. 758 e.) Μηδένα δὲ, κ. τ. λ.—C. Carth. 3. c. 45. (t. 2. p. 1176 b.) Aurelius episcopus dixit: Sed episcopus unus esse potest, per quem dignatione divina presbyteri multi constitui possunt.—Can. Apost. 1. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 437.) Ἐπίσκοπος χειροτονείσθω ὑπὸ ἐπισκόπων δύο ἢ τριῶν, κ. τ. λ.

[8] Cornel. Ep. ad Fab. ap. Euseb. l. 6. c. 43. (v. 1. p. 311. 24.) Οὗτος γάρ τοι ὁ δογματιστὴς, ὁ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἐπιστήμης ὑπεράσπιστὴς, ὁπηνίκα παρασπᾶσθαί τε καὶ ὑφαρπάζειν τὴν μὴ δοθεῖσαν αὐτῷ ἄνωθεν ἐπισκοπὴν ἐπεχείρει, δύο ἑαυτῷ κοινωνοὺς ἀπεγνωκότας τῆς ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίας ἐπελέξατο· ὡς ἂν εἰς βραχύ τι μέρος καὶ ἐλάχιστον τῆς Ἰταλίας ἀποστείλῃ, κἀκεῖθεν ἐπισκόπους τρεῖς, ἀνθρώπους ἀγροίκους καὶ ἀπλουστάτους, πλαστῇ τινὶ ἐπιχειρήσει ἐξαπατήσῃ .... Οὓς παραγενομένους .... συγκλεισθέντας ὑπὸ τινῶν ὁμοίων αὐτῷ τεταγμένων ἀνθρώπων, ὥρᾳ δεκάτῃ μεθύοντας καὶ κραιπαλῶντας, μετὰ βίας ἠνάγκασεν εἰκονικῇ τινὶ καὶ ματαίᾳ χειρεπιθεσίᾳ ἐπισκοπὴν αὐτῷ δοῦναι· κ. τ. λ.

[9] Hær. 75. Aërian. n. 4. See before ch. 2. s. 8. p. 69. n. 58.

order of bishops begets fathers to the Church, which the order of presbyters cannot do; but only begets sons by the regeneration of baptism.'

I know some urge the authority of St. Jerom[10], to prove that the presbyters of Alexandria ordained their own bishop, from the days of St. Mark to the time of Heraclas and Dionysius; and others think the same words prove that he had no new ordination at all. But they both mistake St. Jerom's meaning, who speaks not of the ordination of the bishop, but of his *election;* who was chosen by the presbyters out of their own body, and by them placed upon the bishop's throne; which in those days was no more than a token of his election, and was sometimes done by the people; but the ordination came after that, and was always reserved for the provincial bishops to perform, as shall be showed hereafter.

Ordinati by presb ters disa nulled b the Chur

6. But it may be inquired, What was the practice of the Church in case any presbyters took upon them to ordain? Were their ordinations allowed to stand good or not? I answer; they were commonly reversed and disannulled. As in the known case of Ischyras[11], who was deposed by the Synod of Alexandria, because Colluthus, who ordained him, was no more than a presbyter, though pretending to be a bishop; and in the case of those presbyters who were reduced to the quality of laymen by the Council of Sardica[12], because Eutychianus and Musæus, who ordained them, were only pretended bishops. The Council of Seville, in Spain[13], went a little further: they

[10] Ep. 85. [al. 146.] ad Evagr. [Evang.](t.1.p.1076b.) Alexandriæ, a Marco evangelista usque ad Heraclam et Dionysium episcopos, presbyteri semper unum ex se electum, in excelsiori gradu collocatum episcopum nominabant; quomodo si exercitus imperatorem faciat.

[11] Apol. 2. p. 732. (t. 1. part. 1. p. 152 c. n. 75.) *Ὃς οὐκ ἔστι πρεσβύτερος· ὑπὸ γὰρ Κολλούθου τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου φαντασθέντος ἐπισκοπὴν, καὶ ὕστερον ὑπὸ κοινῆς συνόδου Ὁσίου καὶ τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ ἐπισκόπων κελευσθέντος πρεσβυτέρου εἶναι, καθὸ καὶ πρότερον ἦν, κατεστάθη.* Καὶ *κατὰ ἀκολουθίαν πάντες οἱ ὑπὸ* Κολλούθου *κατασταθέντες ἀνέδραμον εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν τόπον, εἰς ὃν καὶ πρότερον ἦσαν, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸς Ἰσχύρας λαϊκὸς ὤφθη.* —Ep. Cler. Mareot. ibid. p. 784. (ibid. p. 150 d.) *Θαυμάζομεν γὰρ, κ. τ. λ.*

[12] C. 19. (t. 2. p. 641 d.) *Τῆς ἐμῆς μετριότητος ἡ ἀπόφασίς ἐστιν αὕτη . . ἅπαξ τοὺς εἰς κλῆρον ἐκκλησιαστικὸν προαχθέντας ὑπό τινων ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν, ἐὰν μὴ βούλοιντο ἐπανέρχεσθαι εἰς ἃς κατωνομάσθησαν ἐκκλησίας, τοῦ λοιποῦ μὴ ὑποδέχεσθαι. Εὐτυχιανὸν δὲ μήτε ἐπισκόπου ἑαυτῷ διεκδικεῖν ὄνομα· ἀλλ' οὐδὲ* Μουσαῖον *ὡς ἐπίσκοπον νομίζεσθαι.*

[13] Hispal. 2. c. 5. (t. 5. p. 1665 a.) Relatu deductum est [al. relatum est nobis] de quibusdam clericis,

deposed a presbyter and two deacons, because the bishop only laid his hands upon them, whilst a presbyter pronounced the blessing or consecration prayer over them. And some instances might be added of the like nature, which show that then they did not allow bishops so much as to delegate or commission presbyters to ordain in their name, but reserved this entirely to the episcopal function.

7. The common pleas, which some urge to the contrary, derogate nothing from the truth of this observation. For whereas it is said, 1st, That the chorepiscopi were only presbyters, and yet had power to ordain; that seems to be a plain mistake; for all the chorepiscopi of the ancient Church were real bishops, though subordinate to other bishops, as I shall show more particularly hereafter, when I come to speak of their order. 2ndly, It is said, that the city-presbyters had power to ordain by the bishop's license; and that this was established by canon in the Council of Ancyra[14]. But this is grounded only upon a very ambiguous sense, if not a corrupt reading, of that canon. For all the old translators render it much otherwise 'that the city-presbyters shall do nothing[15] without the license and authority of the bishop, in any part of the paroche or diocese belonging to his jurisdiction.' Which agrees with what I have cited before out of the Council of Laodicea, and several other Canons, which make presbyters dependent upon their bishops in the ordinary exercise of their function[16]. And some Greek copies[17] read it, ἐν ἑτέρᾳ παροικίᾳ, which seems to signify that

quorum dum unus ad presbyterum, duo ad levitarum ministerium sacrarentur, episcopus eorum oculorum dolore detentus fertur manum suam super eos tantum [im]posuisse, et presbyter quidam illis contra ecclesiasticum ordinem benedictionem dedisse, ... Hi gradum sacerdotii vel levitici ordinis, quem perverse adepti sunt, amittunt.

[14] C. 13. (t. 1. p. 1461 a.) Χωρεπισκόπους μὴ ἐξεῖναι πρεσβυτέρους ἢ διακόνους χειροτονεῖν, ἀλλὰ μηδὲ πρεσβυτέρους πόλεως, χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπιτραπῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου μετὰ γραμμάτων, ἐν ἑτέρᾳ παροικίᾳ.

[15] Ex versione Dionysii Exigui. c. 12. (ibid. p. 1468 a.) .. Sed nec presbyteris civitatis, sine præcepto episcopi, vel literis, in unaquaque parochia aliquid imperare, nec sine auctoritate literarum ejus in unaquaque parochia aliquid agere.

[16] Compare notes 80—85.

[17] Cod. Can. Edit. Ehinger. [In the Index Auctorum this is termed *Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ Orientalis Gr. et Lat. Wittebergæ*, 1615. 4to. But the only copy of Ehinger I can meet with, viz. in the Bodleian, is entitled *Apostolorum et Sanctorum Conciliorum Decreta Græce et Latine edita Wittebergæ* 1614. 4to. Yet that book gives the Canon (p. 130.) there, numbered 56, but not the words in ἑτέρᾳ παροικίᾳ. Ed.]

presbyters shall not officiate *in another diocese* without letters dimissory from their own bishop.

3rdly. It is urged further, that Novatus, a presbyter of Carthage, ordained Felicissimus a deacon; but this seems to be no more than procuring him to be ordained by some bishop. For Cyprian says[18], 'he made Novatian bishop of Rome, after the same manner as he had done Felicissimus deacon at Carthage.' But now it is certain he did not ordain Novatian, but only was instrumental in procuring three obscure Italian bishops to come and ordain him[19]; and in that sense he might ordain Felicissimus too. But admit it were otherwise; it was only a schismatical act, condemned by Cyprian and the whole Church.

4thly. It is pleaded out of Cassian, that Paphnutius, an Egyptian abbot, ordained one Daniel a presbyter. But, if Cassian's words[20] be rightly considered, he says no such thing, but only that Paphnutius first promoted him to be made a deacon before several of his seniors; and then, intending to make him his successor, he also preferred him to the dignity of a presbyter, which preference or promotion does not at all exclude the bishop's ordination. It may reasonably signify the abbot's choice, which he had power to make; but it cannot so reasonably be interpreted that he ordained him, since this was contrary to the rules and practice of the Church: and considering where and when Paphnutius lived, in the midst of

A manuscript note on the title-page, by Dr. T. Barlow, to whom this copy of Ehinger belonged, states that these canons were published by Tilius in Greek only, Paris, 1540. 4to. This book also have I seen and examined, but with no better success. Fabricius (Biblioth. Græc. Hamb. 1809. 4to. t. 12. p. 197.) mentions the Greek edition of Tilius, as reprinted with a Latin version by Ehinger, Witteberg. 1614. 4to, but makes no mention of any book of the kind in 1615.—Hence, after collating Andr. Gesner (Theologorum aliquot Græcorum Veterum Orthodoxorum Libri Græci, &c. anno 1559. fol.) with Tilius, and having also availed myself of other sources, I cannot find the words in any copy of that Laodicean canon; and consequently I remain at a loss for the means of justifying the author's statement. Ed.]

[18] Ep. 49. [al. 52.] ad Cornel. p. 97. (p. 238.) Plane, quoniam pro magnitudine sua debeat Carthaginem Roma præcedere, illic majora et graviora commisit. Qui istic adversus ecclesiam diaconum fecerat, illic episcopum fecit.

[19] See s. 5. n. 8. p. 78.

[20] Collat. 4. c. 1. (p. 267.) A beato Paphnutio solitudinis ejusdem presbytero, et quidem cum multis junior esset ætate, ad diaconii est prælatus officium.... optansque sibimet successorem dignissimum providere, superstes eum presbyterii honore provexit.

Egypt, among a hundred bishops, in the fifth century, it is not likely he would transgress the canons in so plain a case. Therefore I cannot subscribe to a learned man[21], who says, 'Nothing is more plain and evident, than that here a presbyter ordained a presbyter, which we nowhere read was pronounced null by Theophilus, then bishop of Alexandria, nor any other at that time.' I conceive the contrary was rather evident to them, and therefore they had no reason to pronounce it null, knowing it to be a just and regular ordination.

5thly. I remember but one instance more in ancient Church-history (for modern instances I wholly pass by) that seems to make any thing for the ordination of presbyters; and that is, in the answer given by Pope Leo to a question put to him by Rusticus Narbonensis, 'Whether the ordination of certain persons might stand good, who were only ordained by some *pseudo-episcopi*, *false bishops*, who had no legal and canonical right to their places?' To this he answers[22], 'that if the lawful bishops of those churches gave their consent to their ordination, it might be esteemed valid and allowed; otherwise to be disannulled.' But here it is to be considered, that these *pseudo-episcopi* were in some sense bishops, as being ordained, though illegally, to their places; for they seem to be such as had schismatically intruded themselves into other men's sees, or at least obtained them by some corrupt and irregular practices. Now the Church did not always rescind and cancel the acts of such bishops, but used a liberty either to reverse and disannul the ordinations made by them, or otherwise to confirm and ratify them, as she saw occasion. Therefore, though the general Council of Constantinople[23] deposed all such as were ordained by Maximus, who had simoniacally intruded himself into Gregory Nazianzen's see at Constantinople, yet the Novatian clergy were admitted by the Council of Nice[24], though

[21] Stillingfleet, Irenic. part. 2. ch. 7. n. 8. p. 380. (v. 2. p. 392.) after citing the passage from Cassian.

[22] Ep. 92. ad Rustic. c. 1. (CC. t. 3. p. 1405 e.) Si qui autem clerici ab istis pseudo-episcopis in eis ecclesiis ordinati sunt, quæ ad proprios episcopos pertinebant, et ordinatio eorum cum consensu et judicio præsidentium facta est, potest rata haberi, &c.

[23] C. 4. (t. 2. p. 947 c.) Περὶ Μαξίμου τοῦ Κυνικοῦ, καὶ τῆς κατ' αὐτὸν ἀταξίας τῆς ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει γενομένης· ὥστε μήτε τὸν Μάξιμον ἐπίσκοπον ἢ γενέσθαι ἢ εἶναι, μήτε τοὺς παρ' αὐτοῦ χειροτονηθέντας ἐν οἱῳδήποτε βαθμῷ κλήρου, πάντων καὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτὸν καὶ τῶν παρ' αὐτοῦ γενομένων ἀκυρωθέντων.

[24] C. 8. (t. 2. p. 33 b.) Ὁ ὀνομαζόμενος παρὰ τοῖς λεγομένοις Κα-

ordained by schismatical bishops; and the African Councils[25] allowed the ordinations of the Donatist bishops, though they had long continued in schism, and given schismatical orders to others also. Which shews, that the primitive Church made some difference between orders conferred by schismatical bishops, and those conferred by mere presbyters. I inquire not now into the grounds and reasons of this, but only relate the Church's practice; from which, upon the whole matter, it appears, that this was another difference betwixt bishops and presbyters, that the one had power to ordain, but the other were never authorized or commissioned to do it.

3. A third difference between bishops and presbyters. Presbyters accountable to their bishops, not bishops to their presbyters.

8. Besides this, there was a third difference between bishops and presbyters in point of jurisdiction. Bishops always retained to themselves the power of calling presbyters to an account, and censuring them for their miscarriages in the discharge of their office; but presbyters had no power to censure their bishops, or set up an independent power in opposition to their authority and jurisdiction. When Felicissimus and Augendus set up a separate communion at Carthage against Cyprian, threatening to excommunicate all that communicated with him, Cyprian gave orders to his deputies, being himself then in banishment, to execute first their own sentence upon them, and let them, for their contempt of him and the Church[26], feel the power of excommunication, which was accordingly done by his delegates, as appears from their answer[27] to him. In another place, writing to Rogatian, a bishop who made complaint to Cyprian and the synod of an unruly deacon, he tells him, 'it was his singular modesty to refer the case to them, when he might, by virtue of his own episcopal authority, himself have punished the delinquent[28]; against whom, if he per-

θαροῖς ἐπίσκοπος τὴν τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου τιμὴν ἕξει· πλὴν εἰ μὴ ἄρα δυκοίη τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, τῆς τιμῆς τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτὸν μετέχειν.

[25] Collat. Carth. 1 die. c. 16. (t. 2. p. 1352 d.) Poterit quippe unusquisque nostrum, honoris sibi socio copulato, vicissim sedere eminentius, sicut peregrino episcopo juxta considente collega.

[26] Ep. 38. [al. 41.] (p. 226.) Interim cum Felicissimus comminatus sit, non communicaturos in monte [al. morte] secum, qui nobis obtemperassent, id est, qui nobis communicarent; accipiat sententiam quam prior dixit, ut abstentum se a nobis sciat.

[27] Ep. 39. [al. 42.] ad Cypr. (p. 227.) Abstinuimus communicatione Felicissimum et Augendum, &c.

[28] Ep. 65. [al. 3.] ad Rogatian. (p. 172.) Et tu quidem honorifice circa nos et pro solita tua humilitate fecisti, ut malles de eo nobis conqueri, cum pro episcopatus vigore

sisted in his contempt, he should use the power which belonged to his order, and either depose or suspend him.' Nothing can be more plain and evident, than that in Cyprian's time all bishops were invested with this power of censuring delinquents among the clergy. And any one that looks into the Councils of the following age will find nothing more common than canons which both suppose and confirm this power. As when the Apostolical Canons say[29], 'that no presbyter, or deacon, excommunicated by his own bishop, should be received by any other,' that supposes all bishops to have power to inflict ecclesiastical censures upon their clergy. The like may be seen in the canons of the Council of Nice[30], which allows an appeal in such a case to a provincial synod; and the Council of Sardica[31], which orders the metropolitan to hear and redress the grievance; so also in the Councils of Antioch[32], Chalcedon[33], and many others.

9. Yet it must be owned, that according to the discipline and custom of those times, bishops seldom did any thing of this nature, without the advice and consent of their presbyters, who were their assessors, and as it were the ecclesiastical senate

et cathedræ auctoritate haberes potestatem, qua posses de illo statim vindicari. — Ibid. (p. 173.) Quod si ultra te contumeliis suis exacerbaverit et provocaverit, fungeris circa eum potestate honoris tui, ut eum vel deponas vel abstineas.—See also Ep. 10. [al. 16.] (p. 194.) [Quod enim non periculum metuere debemus de offensa Domini; quando aliqui de presbyteris, nec evangelii, nec loci sui memores, sed neque futurum Domini judicium, neque nunc sibi præpositum episcopum cogitentes, quod nunquam omnino sub antecessoribus factum est, cum contumelia et contemtu præpositi totum sibi vindicent? &c. Ed.]

[29] C. 31. (Cotel. [c. 25.] v. 1. p. 441.) Εἴ τις πρεσβύτερος ἢ διάκονος ἀπὸ ἐπισκόπου γένηται ἀφωρισμένος [al. γένηται ἐν ἀφορισμῷ], τοῦτον μὴ ἐξεῖναι πάρ' ἑτέρου δέχεσθαι.

[30] C. 5. (t. 2. p. 29 c.) Περὶ τῶν ἀκοινωνήτων γενομένων, εἴτε τῶν ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ, εἴτε ἐν λαϊκῷ τάγματι, ὑπὸ τῶν καθ' ἑκάστην ἐπαρχίαν ἐπισκόπων, κρατείτω ἡ γνώμη κατὰ τὸν κανόνα τὸν διαγορεύοντα, τοὺς ὑφ' ἑτέρων ἀποβληθέντας ὑπ' ἑτέρων μὴ προσιέσθαι.

[31] C. 13. (ibid. p. 637 e.) Εἴ τις διάκονος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ἢ καί τις τῶν κληρικῶν ἀκοινώνητος γένηται, καὶ πρὸς ἕτερον ἐπίσκοπον τὸν εἰδότα αὐτὸν καταφύγοι, γινώσκοντα ἀποκεκινῆσθαι αὐτὸν τῆς κοινωνίας παρὰ τοῦ ἰδίου ἐπισκόπου, μὴ χρῆναι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ ὕβριν ποιοῦντα παρέχειν αὐτῷ κοινωνίαν.— C. 14. (ibid. p. 640 b.) . . . . Ὁ ἐκβαλλόμενος ἐχέτω ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον τῆς μητροπόλεως τῆς αὐτῆς ἐπαρχίας καταφυγεῖν.

[32] C. 3. (ibid. p. 564 b.) . . . . Εἰ δὲ καθαιρεθέντα διὰ ταύτην τὴν αἰτίαν δέχοιτο ἕτερος ἐπίσκοπος, κἀκεῖνον ἐπιτιμίας τυγχάνειν ὑπὸ κοινῆς συνόδου, ὡς παραλύοντα τοὺς θεσμοὺς τοὺς ἐκκλησιαστικούς.—C. 4. (ibid. c.) . . . . Τοὺς κοινωνοῦντας αὐτῷ πάντας ἀποβάλλεσθαι τῆς ἐκκλησίας.

[33] C. 9. (t. 4. p. 759 d.) Εἰ δὲ καὶ κληρικὸς ἔχοι πρᾶγμα πρὸς τὸν ἴδιον ἐπίσκοπον, ἢ πρὸς ἕτερον, παρὰ τῇ συνόδῳ τῆς ἐπαρχίας δικαζέσθω.

and council of the Church: of which I shall give a more particular account when I come to speak of the honour and privileges of the order of presbyters. And here it is to be further noted, out of the preceding canons, that, if any clergyman thought himself injured by his bishop, he had liberty to appeal[34] either to the metropolitan or a provincial synod. And in some places, the better to avoid arbitrary power, the canons provided, that no bishop should proceed to censure a presbyter or deacon, without the concurrence of some neighbouring bishops to join with him in the sentence. The first Council of Carthage[35] requires three to censure a deacon, and six to censure a presbyter. The second Council of Carthage requires the same number, according to all correct editions of it[36]; for Crab's edition is palpably false; and yet Blondel lays hold of that corruption, to prove that presbyters and deacons were to be judges of their own bishop; which makes the canon speak mere nonsense, and appoints the bishop to judge himself also. The true reading of the canon is this, 'The criminal cause of a bishop shall be heard by twelve bishops, the cause of a presbyter by six, the cause of a deacon by three joined with his own bishop.' This obliges every bishop to take other bishops into commission with him in criminal causes, but does

[34] Vid. C. Carth. 2. c. 8. (t. 2. p. 1161 d.) Si quis presbyter a præposito suo excommunicatus vel correptus fuerit, debet utique apud vicinos episcopos conqueri, ut ab ipsis ejus causa possit audiri, ac per ipsos suo episcopo reconciliari.—C. Carth. 4. c. 29. (ibid. p. 1202 d.) Episcopus, si clerico vel laico crimen impegerit, deducatur ad probationem in synodum.—It. C. 66. (ibid. p. 1205 b.) Clericus, qui episcopi circa se districtionem injustam putat, recurrat ad synodum.—C. Antioch. c. 12. (ibid. p. 568 a.) Εἴ τις ὑπὸ τοῦ ἰδίου ἐπισκόπου καθαιρεθεὶς .... δέον ἐπὶ μείζονα ἐπισκόπων σύνοδον τρέπεσθαι, καὶ ἃ νομίζει δίκαια ἔχειν προσαναφέρειν πλείοσιν ἐπισκόποις, καὶ τὴν αὐτῶν ἐξέτασίν τε καὶ ἐπίκρισιν ἐκδέχεσθαι. — C. Vasens. 2. c. 5. (t. 3. p. 1457 e.) Si quis episcopi sui sententiæ non acquiescit, recurrat ad synodum. — C. Venet. c. 9. (t. 4. p. 1056 a.) Si quis fortasse episcopi sui judicium cœperit habere suspectum, aut ipsi de proprietate aliqua adversus ipsum episcopum fuerit nata contentio, aliorum episcoporum audientiam, non sæcularium potestatem, debebit ambire.

[35] C. 11. (t. 2. p. 717 b.) Si quis .... aliquam causam habuerit, a tribus vicinis episcopis, si diaconus est, arguatur; presbyter a sex.

[36] C. 10. Placet ut causa criminalis episcopi a duodecim episcopis audiatur; causa presbyteri a sex; causa vero diaconi a tribus cum proprio episcopo.—Crabbe also (t. i. p. 425.) thus reads it corruptly,—Episcopus a duodecim episcopis audiatur, et a sex presbyteris, et a tribus diaconibus cum proprio suo episcopo. [And so does Labbe, (t. 2. p. 1162 c.) Ed.]—Conf. Blondel. Apol. s. 3. (p. 137.)

not authorize presbyters and deacons to sit as judges upon their own bishop. Which may be further evidenced from another canon[37] of the next Council of Carthage, which speaks of a legal number of bishops to judge a presbyter or deacon; and assigns six for a presbyter, and three for a deacon, as the former canons appointed. But for the inferior clergy there was no such restraint laid upon the bishop that I can find: but he alone, by the same canon[38], is allowed to hear their causes and end them. Only they had liberty to appeal, as all others in case of injury done them, to the metropolitan or a provincial synod, which the Nicene Council[39] and many others appoint to be held once or twice a year for that very purpose; that if any clergyman chanced to be unjustly censured by the passion of his bishop, he might have recourse to a superior court, and there have justice done him.

This is the true state and account of the power of bishops over their clergy, as near as I can collect it out of the genuine records of the ancient Church.

CHAP. IV.

Of the power of bishops over the laity, monks, subordinate magistrates, and all persons within their diocese; and of their office in disposing of the revenues of the Church.

1. The next thing to be considered is, *the power of bishops over the people*; which, upon inquiry, will be found to extend itself over all persons, of what rank or quality soever, within their diocese or the bounds and limits of their jurisdiction. The extent of dioceses themselves, and the reasons why some were much greater than others, I do not here consider, but reserve that for a more proper place, to be treated of when we come to speak of churches. What I observe in this place is, that all orders of men within the diocese were subject to the bishop; for, privileges to exempt men from the jurisdiction of

37 C. 8. (ibid. p. 1168 e.) Si autem presbyteri vel diaconi fuerint accusati, adjuncto sibi ex vicinis locis legitimo numero collegarum [in presbyteri nomine sex, [Labbe, ue] in diaconi tribus [Labbe, 10] ipsorum causas discu-

38 C. 8. (ibid.) Reliquorum [clericorum] causas solus episcopus loci agnoscat et finiat.

39 C. 5. (ibid. p. 32 a.) Ἵνα οὖν τοῦτο τὴν πρέπουσαν ἐξέτασιν λαμβάνῃ, καλῶς ἔχειν ἔδοξεν ἑκάστου ἐνιαυτοῦ καθ' ἑκάστην ἐπαρχίαν δὶς τοῦ ἔτους συνόδους γίνεσθαι.

their diocesan were things unknown to former ages. Ignatius[40] makes bold to say, that, 'as he that honours his bishop is honoured of God; so he that does any thing covertly in opposition to him is the servant of Satan;' and Cyprian[41] defines the Church to be 'a people united to its bishop, a flock adhering to its pastor; whence the Church may be said to be in the bishop, and the bishop in the Church; and if any are not with their bishop, they are not in the Church.'

All sub the of ces the

2. Particularly, we may observe of all ascetics, and monks, and hermits, that the laws, both ecclesiastical and civil, subjected them to the bishop of the place where they lived. For ecclesiastical laws, we have two canons in the Council of Chalcedon[42] to this purpose; the first of which prescribes, 'that all monks, whether in city or country, shall be subject to the bishop, and concern themselves in no business, sacred or civil, out of their own monastery, except they have his license and permission upon urgent occasion so to do;' and if any withdraw themselves from his obedience, the other canon pronounces excommunication against them. The same injunctions may be read in the Councils of Orleans[43], Agde[44], Lerida[45], and others; which subject the abbots, as well as monks, to the bishop's care and correction. Justinian confirms all this by a law in the Code[46], which says, 'that all monasteries are to be

[40] Ep. ad Smyrn. n. 9. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 91.] Ὁ τιμῶν ἐπίσκοπον ὑπὸ Θεοῦ τιμηθήσεται· [al. τετίμηται·] ὁ λάθρα ἐπισκόπου τι πράσσων τῷ διαβόλῳ λατρεύει.

[41] Ep. 69. [al. 66.] ad Pupian. (p. 286.) Ecclesia plebs sacerdoti unita [al. adunata] et pastori suo grex adhærens. Unde scire debes episcopum in ecclesia esse, et ecclesiam in episcopo; et si qui cum episcopo non sint, in ecclesia non esse, &c.

[42] C. 4. (t. 4. p. 758 b.) Τοὺς δὲ καθ' ἑκάστην πόλιν καὶ χώραν μονάζοντας ὑποτετάχθαι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ.— It. c. 8. (ibid. p. 759 b.) Οἱ κληρικοὶ τῶν πτωχείων καὶ μοναστηρίων, ὑπὸ τῶν ἐν ἑκάστῃ πόλει ἐπισκόπων τὴν ἐξουσίαν, κατὰ τὴν τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων παράδοσιν, διαμενέτωσαν· καὶ μὴ κατανθαδιάζεσθαι, ἢ ἀφηνιᾷν τοῦ ἰδίου ἐπισκόπου· οἱ δὲ τολμῶντες ἀνατρέπειν τὴν τοιαύτην διατύπωσιν καθ' οἱονδήποτε τρόπον, καὶ μὴ ὑποταττόμενοι τῷ ἰδίῳ ἐπισκόπῳ, εἰ μὲν εἶεν κληρικοὶ, τοῖς τῶν κανόνων ὑποκείσθωσαν ἐπιτιμίοις· εἰ δὲ μονάζοντες ἢ λαϊκοὶ, ἔστωσαν ἀκοινώνητοι.

[43] C. 19. (ibid. p. 1407 e.) Abbates pro humilitate religionis in episcoporum potestate consistant; et si quid extra regulam fecerint, ab episcopis corrigantur.

[44] C. 38. (ibid. p. 1389 d.) Clericis, sine commendatitiis epistolis episcopi sui, licentia non pateat evagandi. In monachis quoque par sententiæ forma servetur.

[45] C. 3. (ibid. p. 1611 d.) De monachis vero id observari placuit, quod synodus Agathensis vel Aurelianensis noscitur decrevisse, etc.

[46] L. 1. t. iii. De Episc. leg. 39. (t. 4. p. 110. ad summ.) Τὰ μοναστήρια τελοῦσιν ὑπὸ τοὺς ἐπισκόπους τῶν

reckoned under the jurisdiction of the bishop of the territories where they are, and that the abbots themselves are part of their care.' In one of his Novels[47] the election of abbots is put into the bishop's hands. And, by other laws[48], no new cells or monasteries were to be erected, but by the consent and license of the bishop, to whose jurisdiction they belonged. It is therefore a very just reflection which Bede and some others[49] from him make upon the state of the Scottish Church, 'that things were in a very unusual and preposterous order, when, instead of abbots being subject to the bishops, the bishops were subject to a single abbot.' This was *ordine inusitato*, as Bede[50] rightly observes, for there was no such practice allowed in the primitive Church.

also all ordinate gistrates natters piritual sdic-1.

3. In those days, the authority of bishops was so highly esteemed and venerable in the eyes of all men, that even the subordinate magistrates themselves were subject to their spiritual discipline and correction. The prefects and governors of cities and provinces were obliged to take their communicatory letters along with them to the bishop of the place, whither the government sent them; and whilst they continued in their office there, they were to be under the bishop's care; who, if they transgressed against the public discipline of the Church, was authorized by the imperial laws to punish them with excommunication. This we learn from a canon of the first Council of Arles[51], which was called by Constantine himself,

ἐνορίων αὐτῶν· καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἡγουμένους ἐπιβλέπουσιν οἱ ἐπίσκοποι, κ.τ.λ.

[47] Novell. 5. c. 9. (t. 5. p. 48. ad summ.) Ordinatione vero abbatum si quando contigerit egere monasterium; abbatem non per ordinem reverendissimorum fieri monachorum, nec omnino eum, qui post primum est, mox abbatem fieri; nec qui post illum secundus est, neque tertium aut reliquos: hoc quod etiam alia lex nostra dicit: sed Deo amabilem locorum episcopum percurrere quidem consequenter per omnes .... et eum qui apparuerit prius optimus inter monachos constitutus et dignus præsulatu eorum, hunc eligere, &c.

[48] Vid. C. Chalced. c. 4. (t. 4. p. 758 h.) *Ἔδοξε μηδένα μηδαμοῦ οἰκοδομεῖν, μηδὲ συνιστᾶν μοναστήριον, ἢ εὐκτήριον οἶκον, παρὰ γνώμην τοῦ τῆς πόλεως ἐπισκόπου.* — C. Agathens. c. 58. (ibid. p. 1392 d.) Cellulas novas, aut congregatiunculas monachorum, absque notitia episcopi prohibemus institui.

[49] Pearson, Vind. Ignat. part i. c. 11. (Cotel. v. 2. p. 333.) Alterius plane generis est, quod e Scotia petit argumentum, &c.

[50] Hist. Gent. Angl. l. 3. c. 4. (p. 107. 7.) Habere autem solet ipsa insula rectorem semper abbatem presbyterum, cujus juri et omnis provincia, et ipsi etiam episcopi ordine inusitato debeant esse subjecti.

[51] C. 7. (t. 1. p. 1427 e.) De præsidibus .... placuit, ut cum promoti fuerint, literas accipiant eccle-

tified its canons, and gave them as it were the force of l sanctions. And, by virtue of this power, they somensheathed the spiritual sword against impious and proagistrates, and cut them off from all communion with urch. Of which we have an instance in Synesius, bishop emais[52], excommunicating Andronicus, the governor, for elties and blasphemies; and many other such examples, vill be mentioned when we come to treat particularly of cipline of the Church. As to what concerns the bishop's o inspect and examine the acts and decrees of subordiagistrates, Socrates[53] assures us, it was practised by f Alexandria, in reference to Orestes the Præfectus alis of Egypt; though, as he intimates, it was some ce to him to be under his inspection.

ut it must be owned and spoken to the glory of those re bishops, that they challenged no power, as of right ng to them, but only that which was spiritual. They as yet lay claim to both swords, much less endeavoured t the temporal sword out of the magistrate's hand, and e princes under pretence of excommunication. The bishops of Rome themselves always professed obedience jection to the emperor's laws: which I shall not stand prove, since it has so frequently and so substantially ne by several of our learned writers[54]; and it is conby the more ingenuous of the Romish writers[55] them-

communicatorias. Ita tamen ibuscunque locis gesserint, opo ejusdem loci cura de ur: at cum cœperint contra m publicam agere, tum communione excludantur. et de his [fiat] qui remagere volunt.

58. ad Episcop. (p. 202 d. ν ἀναιδεύτῳ γνώμῃ καὶ γλώτνεφθέγξατο τὴν φωνὴν, μεθ' ι νουθετητέος ὁ ἄνθρωπος, τερ μέλος ἀνιάτως ἔχον, ἀποῆμῶν, ἵνα μὴ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ καὶ ον συμφθείρηται.

. c. 13. (v. 2. p. 358. 18.) δὲ καὶ πρότερον μὲν ἐμίσει ντείαν τῶν ἐπισκόπων, ὅτι το πολὺ τῆς ἐξουσίας τῶν ἐκ ἄρχειν τεταγμένων· μάλιστα δὲ ὅτι καὶ ἐπόπτεύειν αὐτοῦ τὰς διατυπώσεις Κύριλλος ἐβούλετο.

[54] See Bishop Morton's Grand Imposture of the Church of Rome, ch. 11. (pp. 169 seqq.)—Roffens. de Potest. Pap. in Temporal. l. 2. c. 2. (pp. 167 seqq.) Duæ sunt potestates, &c.

[55] Otho, s. Otto Frisingens. Chron. l. 6. c. 35. (p. 127.) Lego et relego Romanorum regum et imperatorum gesta, et nusquam invenio quemquam eorum ante hunc [Henricum IV.] a Romano pontifice excommunicatum, vel regno privatum, &c.—Greg. Tholosan. de Republ. l. 26. c. 5. nn. 10, 11. (p. 215 c. 7.) Illud tantum ex his nunc colligo, difficilem esse quæstionem, num summi pontifices deponere imperatorem vel

selves, that Gregory the Seventh was the first pope that pretended to depose Christian princes. The ancient bishops of the Church laid no claim to coercive power over the bodies or estates of men; but if ever they had occasion to make use of it, they applied themselves to the secular magistrate for his assistance: as in the case of Paulus Samosatensis, who kept possession of the bishop's house, after he was deposed from his bishopric by the Council of Antioch. The fathers in that Council, having no power to remove him, petitioned the emperor Aurelian against him[56]; who, though an heathen, gave judgment on their side, and ordered his officers to see his sentence put in execution. And thus the case stood, as to the power of bishops, for some ages after under Christian emperors: insomuch that Socrates[57] notes it as a very singular thing in Cyril, bishop of Alexandria, that he undertook by his own power 'to shut up the Novatian churches, seizing upon their plate and sacred utensils, and depriving their bishop Theopemptus of his substance.' This was done *παρὰ τῆς ἱερατικῆς τάξεως, beyond any ordinary power that bishops were then invested with;* and though in after-ages they attained to this power, yet it was not by any inherent right of their order, but by the favour and indulgence of secular princes. It must here also be further noted, that it was ever esteemed dishonourable for bishops so much as to petition the secular power against the life of any man, whom they had condemned by spiritual censures; and therefore, when Ithacius and some other Spanish bishops prevailed with Maximus to slay the heretic Priscillian, St. Martin and many other pious bishops petitioned against it[58], saying, 'it was enough to expel heretics

regem possint, qui olim habuit instituendi summum pontificem potestatem. Quin et inveniuntur plures destitutiones et depositiones factæ ab imperatore summorum pontificum, &c.

[56] Vid. Euseb. l. 7. c. 30. (v. 1. p. 364. 4.) Ἀλλὰ γὰρ μηδαμῶς ἐκστῆναι τοῦ Παύλου τοῦ τῆς ἐκκλησίας οἴκου θέλοντος, βασιλεὺς ἐντευχθεὶς Αὐρελιανὸς, αἰσιώτατα περὶ τοῦ πρακτέου διείληφε· τούτοις νείμαι προστάττων τὸν οἶκον, οἷς ἂν οἱ κατὰ τὴν Ἰταλίαν καὶ τὴν Ῥωμαίων πόλιν ἐπίσκοποι τοῦ δόγματος ἐπιστέλλοιεν.

[57] Lib. 7. c. 7. (v. 2. p. 352. 39.) Εὐθέως οὖν Κύριλλος, τὰς ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ Ναυατιανῶν ἐκκλησίας ἀποκλείσας, πάντα μὲν αὐτῶν τὰ ἱερὰ κειμήλια ἔλαβεν· τὸν δὲ ἐπίσκοπον αὐτῶν Θεόπεμπτον, πάντων ὧν εἶχεν ἀφείλετο.

[58] Sulp. Sever. l. 2. p. 119. (p. 449.) .... Maximum orare, ut sanguine infelicium abstineret: satis superque sufficere, ut episcopali sententia hæretici judicati ecclesiis pellerentur.

from the churches;' and when they could not prevail, they showed their resentments of the fact against the author of it, refusing to admit Ithacius, the sanguinary bishop, to their communion. So great a concern had those holy men to keep within the bounds of their spiritual jurisdiction!

An account of the *literæ formatæ*, and the prerogatives of bishops in granting them to all persons.

5. And it may be observed, that the authority of bishops was never greater in the world than when they concerned themselves only in the exercise of their own proper spiritual power. For then they had an universal respect paid them by all sorts of men; insomuch that no Christian would pretend to travel, without taking *letters of credence* with him from his own bishop, if he meant to communicate with the Christian Church in a foreign country. Such was the admirable unity of the Church Catholic in those days, and the blessed harmony and consent of her bishops among one another! These letters were of divers sorts, according to the different occasions or quality of the persons that carried them. They are generally reduced to three kinds; the *epistolæ commendatoriæ, communicatoriæ*, and *dimissoriæ*. The first were such as were granted only to persons of quality, or else persons whose reputation had been called in question, or to the clergy, who had occasion to travel into foreign countries. The second sort were granted to all who were in the peace and communion of the Church; whence they were also called *pacificæ*, and *ecclesiasticæ*, and sometimes *canonicæ*. The third sort were such as were only given to the clergy when they were to remove from their own diocese and settle in another; and they were to testify that they had their bishop's leave to depart; whence they were called *dimissoriæ*, and sometimes *pacificæ* likewise. All these went under the general name of *formatæ*, because they were written in a *peculiar form*, with some particular marks and characters, which served as special signatures to distinguish them from counterfeits. I shall not stand now to give any further account of them here, but only observe, that it was the bishop's sole prerogative to grant them; and none might presume to do it, at least without his authority and commission. The Council of Antioch[59] allows country bishops to

[59] C. 8. (t. 2. p. 565 a.) ..... Τοὺς δὲ ἀνεπιλήπτους χωρεπισκόπους διδόναι εἰρηνικάς.

write them, but expressly forbids presbyters the privilege. And whereas in times of persecution, some confessors, who were of great esteem in the church, would take upon them to grant such letters by their own authority, and in their own names; the Councils of Arles[60] and Eliberis[61] forbade them to do it; and ordered all persons, who had such letters, to take new communicatory letters from the bishop. Baronius[62] and the common editors of the Councils, who follow him, mistake these letters for the libels, which the confessors were used to grant to the *lapsi*, to have them admitted into the communion of the Church again. But Albaspiny[63] corrects this mistake; and rightly observes, that those Councils speak not of such libels as were given to the *lapsi*, but of such as were given to all Christians, who had occasion to travel into foreign countries; which it belonged to the bishops to grant, and not to the confessors, whatever authority they might otherwise have obtained by their honourable confession of Christ in time of persecution. The Council of Eliberis[64] takes notice of another abuse of this nature, and corrects it; which was, that some women of famous renown in the Church, clergymen's wives, as Albaspiny thinks, or rather the wives of bishops, would presume both to grant and receive such letters by their own authority: all which the Council orders to be sunk, as being dangerous to the discipline and communion of the Church, and an encroachment upon the bishop's power, to whom alone it be-

[60] Arelat. 1. c. 9. (t. 1. p. 1428 b.) De his, qui confessorum literas offerunt, placuit, ut sublatis eis literis, [alias] accipiant communicatorias.

[61] C. 25. (ibid. p. 973 d.) Omnis qui attulerit literas confessionis, sublato nomine confessoris ..... communicatoriæ ei dandæ sunt literæ.

[62] An. 142. n. 9. (t. 2. p. 106 c.) Erat quoque olim tempore persecutionis ecclesiæ genus literarum, quæ dicebantur confessoriæ, quæ a Christianis, qui pro Christi nomine detinerentur in carcere, pro commendatione lapsorum ad episcopos dari solebant.—Loaysa, Not. in C. Eliber. c. 25. (t. 1. p. 983 e.) Epistolæ commendatitiæ, quæ literæ appellantur fidelibus datæ, diversi generis erant: complectebantur enim literas confessionis; et hæ erant dignitatis et honoris, quibus in ecclesiis magna reverentia habebatur, &c.

[63] Not. in C. Eliber. c. 25. (ibid. p. 993 e.) Permagna est dissensio de hujus canonis sententia et explicatione, et noni Arelatensis primi, ... Quorundam opinio est hos ipsos canones explicandos esse de literis, quas lapsi, ad jus communionis recuperandum, a martyribus qui essent in vinculis extorquebant.

[64] C. 81. (ibid. p. 979 a.) Ne feminæ suo potius, absque maritorum nominibus, laicis scribere audeant: quæ fideles sunt, vel literas alicujus pacificas ad suum solum nomen scriptas accipiant.

longed to grant them. For, by all ancient canons, this privilege is reserved entirely to bishops, and this set their authority very high in the Church; for no one, either clergy or laity, could communicate in any church beside his own, without these testimonials from his bishop: as may be seen in the Councils of Carthage[65], and Agde[66], and many others.

Of the bisho powe dispo of the venu the C

6. I have but one thing more to observe concerning the power of bishops over the Church; and that is, their authority and concern in *disposing of the revenues of the Church.* I intend not here to enter upon the discourse of ecclesiastical revenues, which has its proper place in this work hereafter; but only to suggest now, that it was part of the bishop's office and care to see them managed and disposed of to the best advantage. The Councils of Antioch[67] and Gangra[68] have several canons to this purpose; that all the incomes and oblations of the Church shall be dispensed at the will and discretion of the bishop, to whom the people and the souls of men are committed. Those called the Apostolical Canons[69] and Constitutions[70] speak

[65] Carth. 1. c. 7. (t. 2. p. 716 b.) .... Clericus vel laicus non communicet in aliena plebe sine literis episcopi sui.

[66] C. 52. (t. 4. p. 1392 a.) Presbytero, aut diacono, vel clerico sine antistitis sui epistolis ambulanti communionem nullus impendat.—C. Epaun. c. 6. (ibid. p. 1577 b.) Ubi eadem verba.—C. Laodic. c. 41. (t. 1. p. 1504 d.) .. Οὐ δεῖ ἱερατικὸν ἢ κληρικὸν ἄνευ κανονικῶν γραμμάτων ὁδεύειν.—C. Milevit. c. 20. (t. 2. p. 1542 b.) Placuit, ut quicunque clericus, propter necessitatem suam alicubi ad comitatum ire voluerit, formatam ab episcopo accipiat.—C. Antioch. c. 7. (ibid. p. 564 e.) Μηδένα ἄνευ εἰρηνικῶν δέχεσθαι τῶν ξένων.

[67] C. 24. (ibid. p. 572 c.) Τὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καλῶς ἔχειν φυλάττεσθαι δεῖν μετὰ πάσης ἐπιμελείας, καὶ ἀγαθῆς συνειδήσεως, καὶ πίστεως τῆς εἰς τὸν πάντων ἔφορον καὶ κριτὴν Θεόν· ἃ καὶ διοικεῖσθαι προσήκει μετὰ κρίσεως καὶ ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τοῦ πεπιστευμένου πάντα τὸν λαὸν, καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν συναγομένων.—Conf. c. 25. (ibid. p. 573 a.) Ἐπίσκοπον ἔχειν τῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας πραγμάτων ἐξουσίαν, ὥστε διοικεῖν εἰς πάντας τοὺς δεομένους μετὰ πάσης εὐλαβείας καὶ φόβου Θεοῦ.

[68] C. 7. (ibid. p. 419 b.) Εἴ τις καρποφορίας ἐκκλησιαστικὰς ἐθέλοι λαμβάνειν, ἢ διδόναι ἔξω τῆς ἐκκλησίας, παρὰ γνώμην τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, ἢ τοῦ ἐγκεχειρισμένου τὰ τοιαῦτα, καὶ μὴ μετὰ γνώμης αὐτοῦ ἐθέλοι πράττειν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.—C. 8. (ibid. b.) Εἴ τις διδοῖ ἢ καρποφορίαν παρεκτὸς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, ἢ τοῦ ἐπιτεταγμένου εἰς οἰκονομίαν, καὶ ὁ διδοὺς καὶ ὁ λαμβάνων ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.

[69] C. 31. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 443.) Πάντων τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν πραγμάτων ὁ ἐπίσκοπος ἐχέτω τὴν φροντίδα, καὶ διοικείτω αὐτὰ ὡς Θεοῦ ἐφορῶντος. — C. 40. (Cotel. [c. 44.] ibid.) Προστάσσομεν τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν τῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας πραγμάτων.

[70] L. 11. c. 25. (Cotel. ibid. p. 236.) [Consult the whole chapter, which treats of tithes, of first-fruits, and of oblations: also how the bishop is either to appropriate portions to himself, or to distribute them to others, as a steward. Ed.]

of the same power. And Cyprian[71] notes, that all, who received maintenance from the Church, had it *episcopo dispensante, by the order and appointment of the bishop.* He did not indeed always dispense with his own hands, but by proper assistants, such as his archdeacon, and the *œconomus*, which some canons[72] order to be one of the clergy of every church; but these officers were only stewards under him, both of his appointing, as St. Jerom[73] observes, and also accountable to him, as the supreme governor of the Church. Whence Possidius[74] takes notice of the practice of St. Austin, 'that though neither seal nor key was ever seen in his hand, but some of his clergy were always his administrators, yet he had his certain times to audit their accounts;' so that all was still his act, though administered and dispensed by the hands of others. And this was agreeable to the primitive rule and practice of the Apostles, to whose care and custody the people's oblations, and things consecrated to God, were committed: they chose deacons to be their assistants, as bishops did afterwards; still retaining power in their own hands to direct and regulate them in the disposal of the public charity, as prime stewards of God's revenue, and chief masters of his household.

CHAP. V.

Of the office of bishops, in relation to the whole Catholic Church.

1. We have hitherto considered the office and power of

[71] Ep. 38. [al. 41.] (p. 226.) .... Ut cum ecclesia matre remanerent, et stipendia ejus, episcopo dispensante, perciperent. — Just. Mart. Apol. 1. (p. 98. lin. ult. et p. 99 a.) Οἱ εὐποροῦντες δὲ καὶ βουλόμενοι, κατὰ προαίρεσιν ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ, ὃ βούλεται δίδωσι· καὶ τὸ συλλεγόμενον παρὰ τῷ προεστῶτι ἀποτίθεται, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπικουρεῖ ὀρφανοῖς τε καὶ χήραις, καὶ τοῖς διὰ νόσον, ἢ δι' ἄλλην αἰτίαν λειπομένοις, καὶ τοῖς ἐν δεσμοῖς οὖσι, καὶ τοῖς παρεπιδήμοις οὖσι ξένοις, καὶ ἁπλῶς πᾶσι τοῖς ἐν χρείᾳ οὖσι κηδεμὼν γίνεται.

[72] C. Chalced. c. 26. (t. 4. p. 767 c.) Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἔν τισιν ἐκκλησίαις, ὡς περιηχήθημεν, δίχα οἰκονόμων οἱ ἐπίσκοποι τὰ ἐκκλησιαστικὰ χειρίζουσι πράγματα· ἔδοξε πᾶσαν ἐκκλησίαν ἐπίσκοπον ἔχουσαν, καὶ οἰκονόμον ἔχειν ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου κλήρου, οἰκονομοῦντα τὰ ἐκκλησιαστικὰ κατὰ γνώμην τοῦ ἰδίου ἐπισκόπου· ὥστε μὴ ἀμάρτυρον εἶναι τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ ἐκ τούτου τὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας σκορπίζεσθαι πράγματα, κ. τ. λ.

[73] Ep. 2. [al. 52.] ad Nepotian. (t. 1. p. 262 c. n. 9.) Sciat episcopus, cui commissa est ecclesia, quem dispensationi pauperum, curæque præficiat.

[74] [Vit. August. (t. 10. append. p. 273 c.) Nunquam clavem, nunquam annulum in manu habens, sed ab eisdem [clericis] domus præpositis cuncta et accepta et erogata notabantur, &c. Ed.]

bishops over the clergy and people of their own particular Churches. But there is yet a more eminent branch of their pastoral office and care behind, which is, their superintendency over the whole Catholic Church, in which every bishop was supposed to have an equal share; not as to what concerned external polity and government, but the prime essential part of religion, the preservation of the Christian faith. Whenever the faith was in danger of being subverted by heresy, or destroyed by persecution, then every bishop thought it part of his duty and office to put to his helping hand, and labour as much for any other diocese as his own. Dioceses were but limits of convenience, for the preservation of order in times of peace. But the faith was a more universal thing, and when war was made upon that, then the whole world was but one diocese, and the whole Church but one flock; and every pastor thought himself obliged to feed his Great Master's sheep, according to his power, whatever part of the world they were scattered in. In this sense, every bishop was an universal pastor, and bishop of the whole world; as having a common care and concern for the whole Church of Christ. This is what St. Austin[75] told Boniface, bishop of Rome, 'that the pastoral care was common to all those who had the office of bishop; and though he was a little higher advanced toward the top of Christ's watch-tower, yet all others had an equal concern in it.' St. Cyprian[76] testifies for the practice of his own time, 'that all bishops were so united in one body, that if any of the body broached any heresy, or began to lay waste and tear the flock of Christ, all the rest immediately came in to its rescue; for though they were many pastors, yet they had but one flock to feed; and every one was obliged to take care of all the sheep of Christ, which he had purchased with his blood.' In this

[75] Cont. Ep. Pelag. in Præf. ad Bonifac. (t. 10. p. 412 b.).... Communisque sit omnibus nobis, qui fungimur episcopatus officio, quamvis in ea præemineas celsiore fastigio, specula pastoralis. [Ed. Vet. reads,—in eo præemineas celsiore fastigio speculæ pastoralis. Ed.]

[76] Ep. 67. [al. 68.] ad Steph. p. 178. (pp. 292, 293.) Idcirco... copiosum corpus est sacerdotum, concordiæ mutuæ glutino atque unitatis vinculo copulatum, ut si quis ex collegio nostro hæresin facere, et gregem Christi lacerare et vastare tentaverit, subveniant cæteri..... Nam etsi pastores multi sumus, unum tamen gregem pascimus, et oves universas, quas Christus sanguine suo et passione quæsivit, colligere et fovere debemus.

sense, Gregory Nazianzen[77] says of Cyprian, 'that he was an universal bishop, that he presided not only over the Church of Carthage and Afric, but over all the regions of the west, and over the east, and south, and northern parts of the world also.' He says the same of Athanasius[78], 'that, in being made bishop of Alexandria, he was made bishop of the whole world.' Which agrees with St. Basil's observation concerning him[79], 'that he had the care of all churches, as much as that which was peculiarly committed to him.' Chrysostom[80] in like manner styles Timothy 'bishop of the universe;' and, in compliance with this customary character, the author under the name of Clemens Romanus[81] gives St. James, bishop of Jerusalem, the title of 'governor of all Churches, as well as that of Jerusalem.' Chrysostom[82] says, St. Paul had 'the whole world committed to his care, and every city under the sun;' that he was 'the teacher of the universe[83],' and 'presided over all churches[84];' which he repeats in many places of his writings. Nor was this prerogative so peculiar to the Apostles, but that every bishop, in some measure, had a right and title to the same character.

What respect the whole world one diocese, and

2. Hence came that current notion, so frequently to be met with in Cyprian, of but one bishopric in the Church; wherein every single bishop had his share in such a manner, as to have

[77] Orat. 18. in Laud. Cypr. (t. 1. p. 281 a.) Οὐ γὰρ τῆς Καρχηδονίων προκαθέζεται μόνον ἐκκλησίας, οὐδὲ τῆς ἐξ ἐκείνου καὶ δι' ἐκεῖνον περιβόητου μέχρι τῆς Ἀφρικῆς, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάσης τῆς ἑσπερίου, σχεδὸν δὲ καὶ τῆς ἑῴας αὐτῆς, νοτίου τε καὶ βορίου λήξεως.

[78] Orat. 21. in Laud. Athanas. (ibid. p. 377 a.)

[79] Ep. 411. [al. 69.] ad Athanas. (t. 3. part. 1. p. 231 d. n. 1.) Ἡ μέριμνά σοι πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τοσαύτη, ὅση καὶ τῆς ἰδίως παρὰ τοῦ κοινοῦ Δεσπότου ἡμῶν ἐμπιστευθείσης ἐπίκειται.

[80] Hom. 6. [al. 8.] adv. Jud. t. 1. p. 542. (t. 1. p. 685 d.) Ἀναμνήσθητι τοῦ μακαρίου Τιμοθέου.... εἰ δὲ ὁ δίκαιος ἐκεῖνος καὶ ἅγιος, καὶ τὴν τῆς οἰκουμένης προστασίαν ἐγκεχειρισμένος κ. τ. λ.

[81] Ep. ad Jacob. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 605.) .. Διέποντι δὲ τὴν Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἁγίαν Ἑβραίων ἐκκλησίαν καὶ τὰς πανταχῇ Θεοῦ προνοίᾳ ἱδρυθείσας καλῶς, κ. τ. λ.—Cf. Rufin. Interpret. (ibid. p. 611.) Clemens Jacobo .... regenti Hebræorum sanctam ecclesiam in Hierosolymis, sed et omnes ecclesias, quæ ubique Dei providentia fundatæ sunt.

[82] Hom. 17. in illud, Salutate Priscillam &c. t. 5. p. 241. (t. 3. p. 173 d.) .... Ὅτι τὴν οἰκουμένην ἅπασαν ἐγκεχειρισμένος, καὶ γῆν, καὶ θάλατταν, καὶ τὰς ὑφ' ἡλίου πόλεις ἅπασας, κ. τ. λ.

[83] Hom. 6. in Terr. Mot. et Laz. t. 5. p. 107. (t. 1. p. 786 e.) ... Τῆς οἰκουμένης διδάσκαλος, κ. τ. λ.

[84] Hom. 17. ut supr. p. 248. (t. 3. p. 179 a.) .... Τῆς οἰκουμένης διδάσκαλος ὤν, τοὺς τὴν γῆν οἰκοῦντας ἅπαντας ἐπιτραπεὶς, καὶ τὰς ὑφ' ἡλίῳ κειμένας ἐκκλησίας ἁπάσας καὶ δήμους καὶ ἔθνη καὶ πόλεις μετὰ πολλῆς θεραπεύων ἐπιμελείας.

an equal concern in the whole;—*episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur*[85], *there is but one bishopric in the Church, and every bishop has an undivided portion in it.* He does not say, it was a monarchy in the hands of any single bishop, but a diffusive power, that lay in the whole college of bishops[86], every one of which had a title to feed the whole Church of God, and drive away heresy out of any part of it. In this sense, the bishop of Eugubium's power extended as far as the bishop of Rome's; the bishop of Rhegium was as much bishop of the whole Church as Constantinople, and Tanis equal to Alexandria; for in St. Jerome's[87] language they were all *ejusdem meriti*, and *ejusdem sacerdotii, of the same merit, and equal in their priesthood*, which was but one. In things that did not appertain to the faith, they were not to meddle with other men's dioceses, but only to mind the business of their own; but when the faith or welfare of the Church lay at stake, and religion was manifestly invaded, then, by this rule of there being but one episcopacy, every other bishopric was as much their diocese as their own; and no human laws or canons could tie up their hands from performing such acts of their episcopal office in any part of the world, as they thought necessary for the preservation of religion.

but one bishopric in the Church

3. For the better understanding the Church's practice in this point, I shall illustrate it in two or three particular instances. It was a rule in the primitive Church, that no bishop should ordain in another's diocese without his leave; and though this was a sort of confinement of the episcopal power to a single diocese, yet for order's sake it was generally observed. But then it might happen, that in some cases there might be a necessity to do otherwise; as in case the bishop of any diocese

Some particular instances of private bishops acting as bishops of the whole universal Church.

[85] De Unit. Eccles. p. 108. (p. 78.)

[86] Ep. 52. [al. 55.] ad Antonian. p. 112. (p. 249.) .... Item episcopatus unus episcoporum multorum concordi numerositate diffusus, &c. In the same Epistle he often mentions the *Collegium Sacerdotale*, e. g. (p. 241.) Accepi primas literas tuas, frater carissime, concordiam collegii sacerdotalis firmiter obtinentes, &c. —It. Ep. 69. [al. 66.] ad Pupian. (p. 286.) Ecclesiæ denique universæ per totum mundum nobiscum unitatis vinculo copulatæ .... Ecclesia, quæ catholica, una est, scissa non est, neque divisa, sed utique connexa, et cohærentium sibi invicem sacerdotum glutino [leg. glutine] copulata.

[87] Ep. 85. [al. 146.] ad Evagr. [Evang.] (t. 1. p. 1076 d.) Ubicunque fuerit episcopus, sive Romæ, sive Eugubii, sive Constantinopoli, sive Rhegii, sive Alexandriæ, sive Tanis, ejusdem meriti, ejusdem est et sacerdotii.

was turned heretic, and would ordain none but heretical clergy, and persecute and drive away the orthodox. In that case, any catholic bishop, as being a bishop of the universal Church, was authorized to ordain orthodox men in such a diocese, though contrary to the common rule; because this was evidently for the preservation of the faith, which is the supreme rule of all, and therefore that other rule must give way to this superior obligation. Upon this account, when the Church was in danger of being overrun with Arianism, the great Athanasius, as he returned from his exile, made no scruple to ordain in several cities, as he went along[88], though they were not in his own diocese. And the famous Eusebius, of Samosata, did the like in the times of the Arian persecution under Valens. Theodoret[89] says, 'he went about all Syria, Phœnicia, and Palestine, in a soldier's habit, ordaining presbyters and deacons, and setting in order whatever he found wanting in the churches.' He ordained bishops also in Syria and Cilicia, and other places, whose names Theodoret[90] has recorded. Now all this was contrary to the common rules, but the necessity of the Church required it; and that gave them authority in such a case to exert their power, and act as bishops of the whole catholic Church. Epiphanius made use of the same power and privilege in a like case, ordaining Paulinianus, St. Jerom's brother, first deacon, and then presbyter, in a monastery out of his own diocese in Palestine: against which, when some of his adversaries objected, that it was done contrary to canon, he vindicated[91] his

[88] Vid. Socrat. l. 2. c. 24. (v. 2. p. 117. 1.) Ἀθανάσιος διὰ Πηλουσίου ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν ἐπορεύετο ... ἔν τισι δὲ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν καὶ χειροτονίας ἐποίει.

[89] L. 4. c. 13. (v. 3. p. 164. 7.) Οὗτος γὰρ πολλὰς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἐρήμους εἶναι ποιμένων μαθὼν, στρατιωτικὸν ἀμπεχόμενος σχῆμα, καὶ τιάρᾳ καλύπτων τὴν κεφαλὴν, τὴν Συρίαν περιῄει καὶ τὴν Φοινίκην καὶ τὴν Παλαιστίνην, πρεσβυτέρους χειροτονῶν καὶ διακόνους, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τάγματα τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀναπληρῶν· εἰ δέ ποτε καὶ ἐπισκόπων ὁμογνωμόνων ἐπέτυχε, καὶ προέδρους ταῖς δεομέναις ἐκκλησίαις προὐβάλλετο.

[90] L. 5. c. 4. (v. 3. p. 197. 32.) Ὁ μέγας Εὐσέβιος ἐκ τῆς ὑπερορίας ἐπανελθὼν, Ἀκάκιον μὲν, οὗ πολὺ τὸ κλέος, ἐν Βεροίᾳ κεχειροτόνηκεν· ἐν Ἱεραπόλει δὲ Θεόδοτον·.... Εὐσέβιον δὲ Χαλκίδος· Κύρου δὲ τῆς ἡμετέρας Ἰσίδωρον .... φασὶ δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ Εὐλόγιον.. τῆς Ἐδέσης κεχειροτονηκέναι ποιμένα ... ὁ δὲ θεῖος Εὐσέβιος ἔσχατον ἐπίσκοπον Μάριν τῇ Δολιχῇ κεχειροτόνηκε.

[91] Ep. ad Joan. Hierosol. (t. 2. p. 312 a.) Super quo debueras gratulari, intelligens quod ob Dei timorem hoc sumus facere compulsi: maxime cum nulla sit diversitas in sacerdotio Dei, et ubi utilitati Dei providetur. Nam etsi singuli ecclesiarum episcopi habent sub se ecclesias, quibus curam videntur impendere, et nemo super alienam

practice upon the strength of this principle; 'that in cases of pressing necessity, such as this was, where the interest of God was to be served, every bishop had power to act in any part of the Church. For though all bishops had their particular churches to officiate in, and were not ordinarily to exceed their own bounds, yet the love of Christ was a rule above all; and therefore men were not barely to consider the thing that was done, but the circumstances of the action, the time, the manner, the persons for whose sake, and the end for which it was done.' Thus Epiphanius apologizes for the exercise of his episcopal power in the diocese of another man. Now from all this, it appears that every bishop was as much an universal bishop, and had as much the care of the whole Church, as the bishop of Rome himself; there being no acts of the episcopal office, which they could not perform in any part of the world, when need required, without a dispensation, as well as he. All that he enjoyed above others was only the rights of a metropolitan, or a patriarch, and those confined by the canons to a certain district: of which more hereafter in their proper place.

CHAP. VI.

Of the independency of bishops, especially in the Cyprianic age, and in the African Churches.

What meant by the independency of bishops one of another, and their absolute power in their own churches.

1. THERE is one thing more must be taken notice of, whilst we are considering the proper office of bishops, which is the absolute power of every bishop in his own church, independent of all others. For the right understanding the just limits of this power, we are to distinguish between the substantial and the ritual part of religion. For it was in the latter chiefly that bishops had an absolute power in their own church, being at liberty to use what indifferent rites they thought fit in their own church, without being accountable for their practice to any other. In matters of faith indeed, when they corrupted the truth by heretical doctrines, or introduced any rituals that were destructive of it, they were obnoxious to the censure of all other bishops; and every individual of the whole catholic college of bishops, as has been noted in the last chapter, was

mensuram extenditur; tamen præponitur omnibus charitas Christi, in qua nulla simulatio est: nec considerandum quid factum sit, sed quo tempore, et quo modo, et in quibus, et quare factum sit.

authorized to oppose them. But in such indifferent ri were lawful to be used in the Church, every bishop was al to choose for himself, and his own church, such as he th fit and expedient in his own wisdom and discretion.

All bishops had liberty to form their own liturgies.

2. Thus, for instance, though there was but one fo worship throughout the whole Church, as to what conc the substance of Christian worship, yet every bishop w liberty *to form his own liturgy* in what method and wor thought proper, only keeping to the analogy of faith and doctrine. Thus Gregory Nazianzen[92] observes of St. 'that, among other good services which he did for the C of Cæsarea, whilst he was but a presbyter in it, one wa composing of forms of prayer, which, by the consent an thority of his bishop, Eusebius, were used by the church.' this is thought, not improbably, by some[93], to be the draught of that liturgy which bears his name to this The Church of Neo-Cæsarea in Pontus, where St. Basi born, had a liturgy peculiar to themselves, which St. B speaks of in one of his Epistles. Chrysostom's liturgy, he composed for the Church of Constantinople, differed these. The Ambrosian form differed from the Roman, an Roman from others. The Africans had peculiar forms of own, differing from the Roman, as appears from some pas cited by Victorinus Afer and Fulgentius, out of the A Liturgies, which Cardinal Bona[95] owns are not to be fou the Roman.

[92] Orat. 20. in Laud. Basil. (t. 1. p. 340 d.) *Εὐχῶν διατάξεις, καὶ εὐκοσμίας τοῦ βήματος.*

[93] Billius in loc., n. 61. (t. 2. p. 777 c.) Orationes ordinavit, cum alias, tum divinæ mystagogiæ sive liturgiæ, quæ et extant. — Cave, Hist. Liter. (v. 1. p. 194.) Liturgia, cujus autorem Basilium fuisse nulla justa est dubitandi ratio.

[94] Ep. 63. [al. 207.] ad Neocæsar. (t. 3. part. 2. p. 450 b. n. 3.) *Ἐκ νυκτὸς ὀρθρίζει παρ' ἡμῖν ὁ λαὸς ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τῆς προσευχῆς, καὶ ἐν πόνῳ, καὶ ἐν θλίψει, καὶ [ἐν] συνοχῇ δακρύων ἐξομολογούμενοι τῷ Θεῷ· τελευταῖον ἐξαναστάντες τῶν προσευχῶν, εἰς τὴν ψαλμῳδίαν καθίστανται· καὶ νῦν μὲν διχῇ διανεμηθέντες, ἀντιψάλλουσιν ἀλλήλοις, ὁμο τὴν μελέτην τῶν λογίων ἐντεῦθ τύνοντες, ὁμοῦ δὲ καὶ τὴν προ καὶ τὸ ἀμετεώριστον τῶν καρδι τοῖς διακονούμενοι, κ. τ. λ.*

[95] Rer. Liturg. l. 1. c. 7. (p. 187.) Marius Victorinus (lib. 1. adv. Arium), sententi tat ex Liturgia Africana, q Ordine Romano non exstat: inquit, *et in oblatione dicitur, tibi populum circumvitalem, torem bonorum operum, circa substantiam venientem.* Fulg quoque Ruspensis, in Frag editis a Sirmondo, c. 14. in ad loc., quodam testimonio Li Africanæ utitur, quod in R non reperitur.

3. The like observation may be made upon *the creeds* used in divers churches. There was but *one rule of faith*, as Tertullian[96] calls it, and that fixed and unalterable, as to the substance, throughout the whole Church. Yet there were different ways of expressing it, as appears from the several forms still extant, which differ something from one another. Those in Irenæus[97], in Cyprian[98], and Tertullian[99], are not exactly in the same method nor form of words. The creed of Eusebius[1] and his church of Cæsarea differed from that of Jerusalem,

And express the same cre in differe forms.

[96] De Virgin. Veland. c. 1. (p. 173 a.) Regula quidem fidei una omnino est, sola immobilis et irreformabilis, &c.

[97] L. 1. c. 2. (p. 45. 1. Versio Latina.) Ecclesia per universum orbem usque ad fines terræ seminata, et ab apostolis et discipulis eorum accepit eam fidem, quæ est in unum Deum, Patrem, Omnipotentem, *qui fecit cœlum et terram, et mare, et omnia quæ in eis sunt:* et in unum Jesum Christum, Filium Dei, incarnatum pro nostra salute: et in Spiritum Sanctum, qui per prophetas prædicavit dispositiones Dei, et adventum, et eam, quæ est ex Virgine, generationem, et passionem, et resurrectionem a mortuis, et in carne in cœlos adscensionem dilecti Jesu Christi Domini nostri, et de cœlis in gloria Patris adventum ejus, ad recapitulanda universa et resuscitandam omnem carnem humani generis; ut Christo Jesu Domino nostro, et Deo et Salvatori et Regi, secundum placitum Patris invisibilis, *omne genu curvet cœlestium et terrestrium et infernorum, et omnis lingua confiteatur ei* et judicium justum in omnibus faciat: spiritalia quidem nequitiæ, et angelos transgressos, atque apostatas factos, et impios, et injustos, et iniquos, et blasphemos homines in æternum ignem mittat: justis autem et æquis, et præcepta ejus servantibus, et in dilectione ejus perseverantibus, quibusdam quidem ab initio, quibusdam autem ex pœnitentia, vitam donans, incorruptelam loco muneris conferat, et claritatem æternam circumdet.

[98] Ep. 70. ad Episc. Numid. p. 100. (p. 301.) Sed et ipsa interrogatio, quæ fit in baptismo, testis est veritatis. Nam cum dicimus, Credis in vitam æternam, et remissionem peccatorum per ecclesiam? intelligimus remissionem peccatorum non nisi in ecclesia dari. — Ep. 76. [al. 69.] ad Magn. p. 183. (p. 296.) .. Non esse unam nobis et schismaticis symboli legem neque eandem interrogationem. Nam cum dicunt, Credis, &c.

[99] Ibid. (ut supra.) Credendi scilicet in unicum Deum, Omnipotentem, mundi Conditorem, et Filium ejus Jesum Christum, natum ex Virgine Maria, crucifixum sub Pontio Pilato, tertia die resuscitatum a mortuis, receptum in cœlis, sedentem nunc ad dexteram Patris, venturum judicare vivos et mortuos, per carnis etiam resurrectionem.

[1] Ep. ad Cæsariens. ap. Socrat. l. 1. c. 8. (v. 2. p. 23. 15.) *Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν, πατέρα παντοκράτορα, πάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητήν· καὶ εἰς ἕνα Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγον, Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς, ζωὴν ἐκ ζωῆς, Υἱὸν μονογενῆ, πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως, πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων ἐκ Πατρὸς γεγεννημένον· δι' οὗ καὶ ἐγένετο τὰ πάντα, τὸν διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν σαρκωθέντα, καὶ ἐν ἀνθρώποις πολιτευσάμενον· καὶ παθόντα, καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ· καὶ ἀνελθόντα πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα, καὶ ἥξοντα πάλιν ἐν δόξῃ κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· πιστεύομεν καὶ εἰς ἓν Πνεῦμα ἅγιον. Τούτων ἕκαστον εἶναι καὶ ὑπάρχειν πιστεύοντες, Πατέρα ἀληθῶς Πατέρα, καὶ Υἱὸν ἀληθῶς Υἱὸν, καὶ Πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἀληθῶς ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, κ.τ.λ.*

upon which Cyril[2] comments; and that of Cyril's from that in St. James's[3] liturgy. And to omit abundance more, that might be here mentioned, the creed of Aquileia, recited by Ruffin[4], differs from the Roman creed, which is that we commonly call the Apostles' Creed. Now the reason of all this difference could be no other but this, that all bishops had power to frame the creeds of their own churches, and express them in such terms as suited best their own convenience, and to meet with the heresies they were most in danger from. As Ruffin observes, that the words *invisible* and *impassible* were added to the first article in the creed of Aquileia, in opposition to the Patripassian or Sabellian heretics, who asserted that the Father was visible and passible in human flesh, as well as the Son. And it is evident the bishops of other churches used the same liberty, as they saw occasion.

4. It were easy to confirm this observation by many other instances of the like nature; but I shall only name one more, which is, the power every bishop had to *appoint particular days of fasting in his own church*. This we learn from St. Austin's answer to Casulanus about the Saturday-fast. Casulanus was very much troubled and perplexed about it, because he observed in Afric some churches keep it a fast, and others a festival; nay, sometimes in the same church, men were divided in their practice, and one part dined on that day, whilst another fasted. Now, to remove Casulanus's scruple, St. Austin gives him this answer[5], 'that the best way in this case was to follow those who were the rulers of every church; therefore, if he would take his advice, he should never resist his bishop in this matter, but do as he did, without doubt or scruple:' which plainly implies, that it was then in every bishop's power to order or not order this fast in his own church, as he saw most convenient.

[2] Catech. 4. n. 3. et seqq. (p. 52 d.) Πρὸ δὲ τῆς εἰς τὴν πίστιν παραδόσεως, κ. τ. λ.

[3] Miss. Jacob. ap. Bibl. Patr. Gr. Lat. (t. 2. p. 7 d. 4.) Credo in unum Deum Patrem, Omnipotentem, Factorem cœli et terræ, et in unum Dominum Jesum Christum, Filium Dei, &c.

[4] In Symb. (ad calc. Cypr. p. 155.) Credo in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem, Invisibilem et Impassibilem.

[5] Ep. 86. ad Casulan. [al. 36. c. 14.] (t. 2. p. 81 e.) .... Mos eorum mihi sequendus videtur, quibus eorum populorum congregatio regenda commissa est. Quapropter si consilio meo .... adquiescis: episcopo tuo in hac re noli resistere, et quod facit ipse, sine ullo scrupulo vel disceptatione sectare.

5. And indeed these privileges of bishops, and their *absolute and independent power* in all such matters, were nowhere more fully reserved to them than in the African Churches, from the time of Cyprian, who frequently makes mention of this independent power, which extended not only to mere rituals, but to several momentous points of discipline; such as, the case of re-baptizing heretics, admitting adulterers to the communion of the Church again, and the question about the validity of clinic baptism. In these points, Cyprian's opinion and practice differed from others of his fellow-bishops: but yet he assumed no power of censuring those that acted differently from what he did, nor separated from their communion upon it; but left every one to give an account of his own practice to God, the judge of all. For the case of re-baptizing such as were baptized by heretics, he was entirely for it, as is sufficiently known to all: but he was not so zealous for it, as to exercise any judicial power of deposing or excommunicating those who practised otherwise, but declares he left every bishop to his liberty, to act according to his judgment, and answer for what he did to God alone. To this purpose he expresses himself in his letter to Pope Stephen[6], and that to Jubaianus[7], but most fully in his speech delivered at the opening of the great Council of Carthage[8], which met to consider this very question. 'Let us every one now,' says he, 'give our opinion of this matter, judging no man, nor repelling any from our communion, that shall think otherwise; for no one of us makes himself bishop of bishops, or compels his colleagues, by tyran-

The independency of bishops most conspicuous in the African Churches.

[6] Ep. 72. ad Steph. p. 197. (p. 306.) Qua in re nec nos vim cuiquam facimus, aut legem damus, cum habeat in ecclesiæ administratione voluntatis suæ arbitrium liberum unusquisque præpositus, rationem actus sui Domino redditurus.

[7] Ep. 73. ad Jubaian. p. 210. (p. 313.) Hæc tibi breviter pro nostra mediocritate rescripsimus, frater carissime, nemini præscribentes aut præjudicantes, quominus unusquisque episcoporum quod putat faciat, habens arbitrii sui liberam potestatem.

[8] Ap. Cypr. p. 229. (p. 158.) Superest ut de hac ipsa re singuli, quid sentiamus, proferamus; neminem judicantes, aut a jure communionis aliquem, si diversum senserit, amoventes. Neque enim quisquam nostrum episcopum se episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem collegas suos adigit; quando habeat omnis episcopus, pro licentio libertatis et potestatis suæ, arbitrium proprium; tamque judicari ab alio non possit, quam nec ipse potest judicare. Sed expectemus universi judicium Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui unus et solus habet potestatem et præponendi nos in ecclesiæ suæ gubernatione, et de actu nostro judicandi.

nical terror, to a necessity of complying; forasmuch as every bishop, according to the liberty and power that is granted him, is free to act as he sees fit, and can no more be judged by others, than he can judge them. But let us all expect the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who only hath power both to invest us with the government of his Church, and to pass sentence upon our actions.' Thus far Cyprian, in full and open council, declares for the independent power of every bishop, tacitly reflecting upon the bishop of Rome, who pretended to excommunicate those who differed in opinion and practice from him: which Cyprian condemns, as a tyrannical way of proceeding.

For the next point, that is, the case of admitting adulterers to communion again, Cyprian[9] says 'his predecessors in Afric were divided upon the question; but they did not divide communion upon it: for though some bishops admitted adulterers to penance, and others refused to do it, yet they did not censure each other's practice, but preserved peace and concord among themselves, leaving every one to answer to God for his actions.' I know, indeed, some learned persons[10] interpret this liberty of the African bishops so as to make it mean no more than a liberty to follow their own judgment, till such times as the Church should determine the matter in dispute, by making some public decree about it. But I must own, I cannot but think Cyprian meant something more, because he pleads for the same liberty, even after the decrees of a plenary council, as we have seen in his preface to the Council of Carthage.

As to the third question, about the validity of clinic baptism, that is, whether persons who were only sprinkled with water

[9] Ep. 52. [al. 55.] ad Antonian. p. 110. (pp. 247, 248.) Et quidem apud antecessores nostros, quidam de episcopis isthinc in provincia nostra dandam pacem mœchis non putaverunt, et in totum pœnitentiæ locum contra adulteria clauserunt; non tamen a coëpiscoporum suorum collegio recesserunt, aut catholicæ ecclesiæ unitatem vel duritiæ vel censuræ suæ obstinatione ruperunt; ut, quia apud alios adulteris pax dabatur, qui non dabat, de ecclesia separaretur. Manente concordiæ vinculo, et perseverante catholicæ ecclesiæ individuo sacramento, actum suum disponit et dirigit unusquisque episcopus, rationem propositi sui Domino redditurus.

[10] Fell, Not. in loc. citat. (p. 248. n. 2.) Quamdiu nullum ecclesiæ decretum intervenit, quilibet episcopus, omnia ad regimen plebis sibi commissæ, ex animi sui sententia, administrat; ita tamen ut cum aliter sentientibus fraternam caritatem retineat.

in their beds, in time of sickness, and not immersed or washed all over the body in baptism, were to be looked upon as complete Christians; Cyprian, for his own part, resolves it in the affirmative: but yet, if any bishops were otherwise persuaded, that it was not lawful baptism, and upon that ground gave such persons a new immersion, he professes[11] 'that he prescribes to none, but leaves every one to act according to his own judgment and discretion.' This was that ancient liberty of the Cyprianic age, of which I have discoursed a little more particularly in this place, because it shews us what was then the uncontested power and privilege of every bishop in the African Church, which is not so commonly understood in these latter ages.

CHAP. VII.

Of the power of bishops in hearing and determining secular causes.

Bishops commonly chosen arbitrators of men's differences in the primitive Church.

1. We have hitherto considered such offices of the episcopal function, as belonged to all bishops by the laws of God, and the canons of the Church. Besides these, there was one office more, imposed upon them by custom and the laws of the state; which was *the hearing and determining secular causes*, upon the continual applications and addresses that people made to them. For such was the singular character and repute of bishops, and such the entire confidence men generally reposed in them for their integrity and justice, that they were commonly appealed to, as the best arbitrators of men's differences, and the most impartial judges of the common disputes that happened among them. Sidonius Apollinaris[12] often refers to

[11] Ep. 76. [al. 69.] ad Magn. p. 186. (p. 297.) Qua in parte nemini verecundia et modestia nostra præjudicat, quo minus unusquisque, quod putat, sentiat, et quod senserit, faciat.—Ibid. p. 188. (p. 299.).. .. Nemini præscribentes, quo minus statuat quod putat unusquisque præpositus, actus sui rationem Domino redditurus.

[12] L. 3. Ep. 12. (p. 206.) Cæterum nostro quod sacerdoti nihil reservavi; meæ causæ suæque personæ præscius in commune consului, ne vel hæc justo clementius vindicaretur, vel illa justo severius vindicaret. Cui cum tamen totum ordinem rei ut satisfaciens ex itinere mandassem; vir sanctus et justus iracundiæ meæ dedit gloriam, cum nihil amplius ego venia postularem, pronuntians more majorum reos tantæ temeritatis jure cæsos videri, &c.—L. 6. Ep. 2. (p. 384.) Jurgium .... semisopitum vestris modo sinibus infertur. Pacificatæ certantes, et pontificalis auctoritate censuræ, suspectis sibi partibus indicite gra-

this custom; and Synesius[13] calls it part of his own episcopal office and function. St. Ambrose[14] testifies for himself that he was used to be appealed to upon such occasions; and St. Austin[15] says of him, 'that he was often so much employed in hearing causes, that he had scarce time for other business.' And this was St. Austin's case also, who frequently complains[16] of the burden that lay upon him in this respect: for not only Christians, but men of all sects applied to him; insomuch that, as Possidius notes in his Life[17], 'he often spent all the morning, and sometimes the whole day, fasting and hearing their causes; which, though it was a great fatigue to him, yet he was willing to bear it, because it gave him frequent opportunities of instilling the principles of truth and virtue into the minds of the parties that applied themselves to him.'

The original of this custom. What

2. And it is to be observed, that though there be no express text in the New Testament that commands bishops to be judges in secular causes; yet St. Austin was of opinion, that St. Paul,

tiam, dicite veritatem.—Ibid. Ep. 4. (p. 387.) Auctoritas personæ, opportunitas præsentiæ tuæ, inter coram positos facile valebit, si dignabitur, seriem totius indagare violentiæ....Sed quia judicii vestri medicinam expetunt, civilitatemque, qui negotium criminale parturiunt, vestrarum, si bene metior, partium pariter et morum est, aliqua indemni compositione istorum dolori, illorum periculo subvenire; et quodam salubris sententiæ temperamento, hanc partem minus afflictam, illam minus ream, et utramque plus facere securam, &c.

13 Synes. Ep. 105. (p. 248 a.) ... Νομοδιδάσκαλος ὢν καὶ νενομισμένα φθεγγόμενος.

14 Ep. 24. [al. 82.] ad Marcel. (t. 2. p. 1100 d. n. 2.) ... Petierunt causæ patroni prorogari paucorum dierum tempora, ut ego residerem cognitor. Tantus ardor erat Christianis viris, ne præfectus de episcopi judicaret negotio, &c.

15 Confess. l. 6. c. 3. (t. 1. p. 121 a.) Non enim quærere ab eo [Ambrosio] poteram, quod volebam sicut volebam, secludentibus me ab ejus aure atque ore catervis negotiosorum hominum, quorum infirmitatibus serviebat. Cum quibus quando non erat, quod per exiguum temporis erat, aut corpus reficiebat necessariis sustentaculis aut lectione animum.

16 Ep. 110. [al. 213.] (t. 2. p. 790 c.) .... Et non permittor ad quod volo vacare. Ante meridiem et post meridiem occupationibus hominum implicor. — Ep. 147. [al. 33.] (ibid. p. 63 f.) .... Et homines quidem causas suas sæculares apud nos finire cupientes, &c. — De Oper. Monach. c. 29. (t. 6. p. 499 c.) Quærite et agnoscite labores occupationum nostrarum, &c. See n. 18. following.

17 Vit. August. c. 19. (t. 10. append. p. 270 f.) ... Causas [eorum] audiebat diligenter ac pie .... et eas aliquando usque ad horam refectionis, aliquando autem tota die jejunans, semper tamen noscebat et dirimebat. ..... atque compertis rerum opportunitatibus, divinæ legis veritatem partes docebat, eamque illis inculcabat, et eas quo adipiscerentur vitam æternam edocebat et admonebat.

in prohibiting men to go to law before the unbelievers, did virtually lay this obligation upon them: for he says, once and again[18], 'that it was the Apostle that instituted ecclesiastical judges, and laid the burden of secular causes upon them.' By which he means, that the Apostle gave a general direction to Christians to choose arbitrators among themselves. And that custom determined this office particularly to the bishops, as the best qualified by their wisdom and probity to discharge it. And this is very agreeable to St. Paul's meaning, 1 Cor. vi, 4, as some very learned and judicious critics[19] understand him: for though all the common translations render the words ἐξουθενημένους ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, *persons that are least esteemed in the church*, yet Dr. Lightfoot observes, 'that they may as well signify persons of the greatest esteem,' for the original word ἐξουθενημένοι signifies only *private judges* or *arbitrators of men's own choosing*, such as were in use among the Jews, who called them ἰδιῶται and *non-authentici;* not because they were the meanest and most contemptible of the people; but because they were the lowest rank of judges, and not settled as a standing court by the Sanhedrim, but chosen by the litigants themselves to arbitrate their causes. Such *private judges* the Apostle directs the Christians to choose in the Church, and refer their controversies to them: which is not any injunction to choose judges out of the poorest, and meanest, and most ignorant of the people, but rather the contrary, persons that were well qualified by their wisdom and authority to take upon them to be judges, and end controversies among their brethren. Now because none were thought better qualified in these re-

[18] Serm. 24. in Ps. 118. (t. 4. p. 1340 b.) Constituit enim talibus causis ecclesiasticos apostolus cognitores, in foro prohibens jurgare Christianos.—De Oper. Monach. c. 29. (t. 6. p. 499 d.)....Quoniam quantum attinet ad meum commodum, multo mallem per singulos dies certis horis, quantum in bene moderatis monasteriis constitutum est, aliquid manibus operari, et cæteras horas habere ad legendum, et orandum; aut aliquid de divinis literis agendum liberas, quam tumultuosissimas perplexitates causarum alienarum pati de negotiis sæcularibus, vel judicando dirimendis, vel interveniendo præcidendis: quibus nos molestiis idem affixit [plures MSS. *afflixit*] apostolus, non utique suo, sed ejus qui per eum loquebatur arbitrio, quas tamen ipsum perpessum fuisse non legimus.

[19] Lightfoot on 1 Cor. 6, 4. (v. 12. p. 483.) To interpret this word, &c. —Ludovic. de Dieu on the same, (p. 204.) Videtur autem apostolus usitatum Hebræis morem respicere, &c.

spects than bishops, the office of judging upon that account was commonly imposed upon them, and they in decency and charity could not well refuse it. This seems to be the true original of this part of the episcopal office and function.

3. But what was thus begun by custom, while the civil governors were heathens, was afterwards confirmed and established by law, when the emperors became Christians. Eusebius says[20], 'Constantine made a law to confirm all such decisions of bishops in their consistories, and that no secular judges should have any power to reverse or disannul them; forasmuch as the priests of God were to be preferred before any other judge.' And Sozomen adds[21], 'that he gave leave to all litigants to refer their causes to the determination of bishops, whose sentence should stand good, and be as authentic as if it had been the decision of the emperor himself; and that the governors of every province and their officers should be obliged to put their decrees in execution.' There is a law now added at the end of the Theodosian Code, which some take for this very law of Constantine, mentioned by these authors. Selden[22] himself reckons it a genuine piece, but I think Gothofred's arguments are stronger to prove it spurious. For it grants bishops such a power, as neither Eusebius nor Sozomen mention, and all other laws contradict[23]:—viz. 'that if either of the contending parties, the possessor or the plaintiff, was minded to bring the cause before a bishop, either when it was before a secular court or when it was determined, he might do it, though the other party was against it.' Whereas all laws

[20] Vit. Constant. l. 4. c. 27. (v. 1. p. 640. 37.) *Καὶ τοὺς τῶν ἐπισκόπων δὲ ὅρους τοὺς ἐν συνόδοις ἀποφανθέντας ἐπεσφραγίζετο, ὡς μὴ ἐξεῖναι τοῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν ἄρχουσι τὰ δόξαντα παραλύειν· παντὸς γὰρ εἶναι δικαστοῦ τοὺς ἱερεῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ δοκιμωτέρους.*

[21] L. 1. c. 9. (v. 2. p. 21. 18.) *Τῶν δὲ ἐπισκόπων ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὴν κρίσιν ἐπέτρεψε τοῖς δικαζομένοις, ἣν βούλωνται τοὺς πολιτικοὺς ἄρχοντας παραιτεῖσθαι· κυρίαν δὲ εἶναι τὴν αὐτῶν ψῆφον, καὶ κρείττω τῆς τῶν ἄλλων δικαστῶν, ὡσανεὶ παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως ἐξενεχθεῖσαν· εἰς ἔργον δὲ τὰ κρινόμενα ἄγειν τοὺς ἄρχοντας, καὶ τοὺς διακονουμένους αὐτοῖς στρατιώτας.*

[22] Uxor. Hebr. l. 3. c. 28. p. 564. (t. 1. of v. 2. p. 829.) Constantini autem hac de re constitutio, &c.

[23] Extravag. de Elect. Judicii Episc., ad calc. Cod. Theod. (t. 4. p. 303.) Quicunque litem habens, sive possessor, sive petitor erit, inter initia litis, vel decursis temporum curriculis, sive cum negotium peroratur, sive cum jam cœperit promi sententia, judicium eligit sacrosanctæ legis antistitis, illico sine aliqua dubitatione, etiamsi alia pars refragatur, ad episcopum cum sermone litigantium dirigatur.—Vid. Gothofred. Comment. in loc.

and history are against this practice; for no cause was to be brought before a bishop, except both parties agreed by way of compromise to take him for their arbitrator. In this case the bishop's sentence was valid, and to be executed by the secular power, but not otherwise. So that either this was not the genuine law of Constantine, to which Eusebius and Sozomen refer, or else it was revoked and contradicted by all others. Gothofred produces a great many contrary laws; I shall content myself with a single instance.

Yet not allowed in criminal causes; nor in any causes, but when the litigants both agree to take them for arbitrators.

4. In the Justinian Code[24] we have two laws of the emperors Arcadius and Honorius about the same matter, which may serve to explain the law of Constantine; for there any bishops are allowed to judge, and their judgment is ordered to be final, so as no appeal should be made from it; and the officers of the secular judges are appointed to execute the bishop's sentence. But then there are *these two limitations* expressly put: First, that they shall only have power to judge, when both parties agree by consent to refer their causes to their arbitration. And, secondly, where the causes are purely civil, and not criminal causes, where perhaps life and death might be concerned; for in such causes the clergy were prohibited by the canons[25] of the Church, as well as the laws of the State, from being concerned as judges: therefore bishops never suffered any criminal causes to come before them, except such as were to be punished with ecclesiastical censures.

Bishops sometimes made their presbyters and sometimes laymen, their substitutes in this affair.

5. But they had commonly civil causes more than enough flowing in upon them; so that they were forced sometimes to let part of this care devolve upon some other person, whose integrity and prudence they could confide in. This was commonly one of their clergy, a presbyter, or a principal deacon. St. Austin, when he found the burden of this affair begin to press too hard upon him, substituted Eradius, his presbyter[26],

[24] L. 1. tit. 4. leg. 8. (t. 4. p. 149.) Si qui ex consensu apud sacræ legis antistitem litigare voluerint, non vetabuntur. Sed experientur illius in civili duntaxat negotio, more arbitri sponte residentis, judicium.—Ibid. leg. 9. (p. 150.) Episcopale judicium ratum sit omnibus, qui se audiri a sacerdotibus elegerint; eamque eorum judicationi adhibendam esse reverentiam jubemus, quam vestris deferri necesse est potestatibus, a quibus non licet provocare, &c.

[25] C. Tarracon. c. 4. (t. 4. p. 1564 b.) Habeant licentiam judicandi, exceptis criminalibus negotiis.

[26] Ep. 110. [al. 213.] (t. 2. p. 790 c.) Obsecro vos et obstringo per Christum, ut huic juveni, hoc est, Eraclio presbytero, quem hodie in nomine

in his room. And the Council of Tarragone speaks not only of presbyters, but deacons also[27], who were deputed to hear secular causes. And Socrates says[28], 'Sylvanus, bishop of Troas, took the power wholly out of the hands of his clergy, because he had found some of them faulty in making an unlawful gain of the causes that were brought before them; for which reason he never deputed any one of them to be judge, but made some layman his delegate, whom he knew to be a man of integrity and a strict lover of justice. I leave the learned to inquire, whether lay-chancellors in the Church had not their first rise and original from some such occasion as this, whilst bishops deputed laymen to hear secular causes in their name, still reserving the proper spiritual and ecclesiastical power entirely to themselves.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the privilege of bishops to intercede for criminals.

1. I HAVE observed in the foregoing chapter, that bishops were never allowed to be judges in capital or criminal causes, because they were not to be concerned in blood. They were to be so far from having any thing to do in the death of any man, that custom made it almost a piece of their office and duty to save men from death, by interceding to the secular magistrates for criminals that were condemned to die. St. Ambrose often made use of this privilege, as the author of his Life observes, frequently addressing himself to Macedonius[29] and Stilico[30], and other great ministers of the age, in behalf of poor delinquents, to obtain pardon for them. St. Austin did

Christi designo episcopum, successorem mihi, patiamini me refundere onera occupationum mearum. [Eraclius vel Heraclius, ut in MSS. constanter. Ed. Vet. Eradius. See note in loc. t. 2. p. 788, ad calc. ED.]

27 C. 4. (ibid. a.) Ut nullus episcoporum, presbyterorum, vel clericorum, die dominico propositum cujuscunque causæ negotium audeat judicare.

28 L. 7. c. 37. (v. 2. p. 388. 15.) *Κατιδὼν τοὺς κληρικοὺς ἐμπορίαν ποιουμένους τὰς τῶν δικαζομένων ἐρεσχελίας, οὐδένα τὸν τοῦ κλήρου δικαστὴν ἐδίδου ποτέ· ἀλλὰ τὰ βιβλία τῶν δεομένων δεχόμενος, παρεκάλει ἕνα τῶν πιστῶν λαϊκῶν, ὃν ᾔδει φιλοῦντα τὸ δίκαιον· κἀκείνῳ ἐγχειρίσας τὴν ἀκρόασιν, τοὺς δικαζομένους τῆς ἐρεσχελίας ἀπήλασεν.*

29 Paulin. Vit. Ambros. p. 8. (t. 2. præfix. append. p. 10 c.) Temporibus Gratiani, cum ad prætorium Macedonii tunc magistri officiorum pro quodam intercedendum perrexisset, &c.

30 Ibid. p. 12. (p. 12 a.) Homines etiam, qui decepti fuerant, interventu sacerdotis [Ambrosii] dimisit [Stilico].

the same for the Circumcellions, when they were convicted and condemned for murdering some of the Catholic clergy. He wrote two pathetic letters[31] to the African magistrates, Marcellinus Comes and Apringius, desiring that their lives might be spared, and that they might only be punished with close custody and confinement, where they might be set to work and have time allowed them for repentance. The Council[32] of Sardica seems to speak of it as the duty of all bishops to intercede for such as implored the mercy of the Church, when they were condemned to be transported, or banished, or any the like punishment. And the custom was become so general, that it began to be considered as a condition in the election of a bishop, whether he were qualified to discharge this part of his office as well as others. Sidonius Apollinaris[33] instances in such a case, where it was made an objection by the people against the election of a certain bishop, that being a man of a monkish and retired life, he was fitter to be an abbot than a bishop: 'He might intercede,' they said, 'indeed with the Heavenly Judge for their souls, but he was not qualified to intercede with the earthly judges for their bodies.' He was not a man of address, which they then thought necessary to discharge this part of the office of a bishop. They might

[31] Ep. 158. [al. 139.] (t. 2. p. 419 f.g.) Pœna sane illorum, quamvis de tantis sceleribus confessorum, rogo te, ut præter supplicium mortis sit, et propter conscientiam nostram et propter catholicam mansuetudinem commendandam. Ipse enim fructus ad nos pervenit confessionis illorum; quia invenit ecclesia catholica, ubi suam erga atrocissimos inimicos servet atque exhibeat lenitatem. In tanta quippe crudelitate, quæcumque præter sanguinem vindicta processerit, magna lenitas apparebit.—Ep. 159. [al. 133.] (ibid. p. 396 c. d.) ..... Nolumus tamen passiones servorum Dei, quasi vice talionis, paribus suppliciis vindicari. Non quo scelestis hominibus licentiam facinorum prohibeamus auferri; sed hoc magis sufficere volumus, ut vivi et nulla corporis parte truncati, vel ab inquietudine insana ad sanitatis otium legum coërcitione dirigantur, vel a malignis operibus alicui utili operi deputentur. Vocatur quidem et ista damnatio: sed quis non intelligat magis beneficium quam supplicium nuncupandum, ubi nec sæviendi relaxetur audacia, nec pœnitendi subtrahatur medicina? Imple, Christiane judex, pii patris officium; sic succense iniquitati, ut consulere humanitati memineris: &c.

[32] C. 7. (t. 2. p. 633 b.) Ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ πολλάκις συμβαίνει τινὰς, οἴκτου δεομένους, καταφυγεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, διὰ τὰ ἑαυτῶν ἁμαρτήματα εἰς περιορισμὸν ἢ νῆσον καταδικασθέντας, ἢ αὖ πάλιν οἱαδηποτοῦν ἀποφάσει ἐκδεδομένους· τοῖς τοιούτοις μὴ ἀρνητέαν εἶναι τὴν βοήθειαν, ἀλλὰ χωρὶς μελλησμοῦ καὶ ἄνευ τοῦ διστάσαι τοῖς τοιούτοις αἰτεῖσθαι συγχώρησιν.

[33] L. 7. Ep. 9. (in Concione, p. 443.) Hic qui nominatur, inquiunt, non episcopi, sed potius abbatis complet officium: et intercedere magis pro animabus apud cœlestem, quam pro corporibus apud terrenum judicem potest.

perhaps judge wrong, as those in St. Jerom[34] did, who pretended that clergymen ought to give splendid entertainments to the secular judges, that they might gain an interest in them; whom St. Jerom justly reproves, telling them, 'that any judge would pay a greater reverence to a pious and sober clergyman than to a wealthy one, and would respect him more for his holiness than his riches.' However, this shews what was then the common custom, and how great an interest bishops generally had in the secular magistrate, who seldom rejected any petitions of this nature. Socrates notes, that even some of the Novatian bishops enjoyed this privilege, as Paulus[35] of Constantinople, and Leontius[36] of Rome, at whose intercession Theodosius the emperor pardoned Symmachus, who had been guilty of treason, in making a panegyric upon Maximus the tyrant, but, after his death, fled for sanctuary to a Christian church.

reasons bishops ceded some minals, not for ers.

2. We may here observe, that crimes in themselves of a very heinous nature, such as treason and murder, were sometimes pardoned at their request. But we are not to imagine that bishops at any time turned patrons for criminals to the obstruction of public justice, (which would have been to have cut the sinews of government,) but only in such cases where pardon would manifestly be for the benefit and honour both of the Church and commonwealth, or else where the crimes themselves had some such alleviating circumstances as might incline a compassionate judge to grant a pardon. As when St. Ambrose interceded with Stilico for the pardon of some poor deluded wretches, whom Stilico's own servant by forgery had drawn into an error; their ignorance might reasonably be pleaded in their behalf. And when St. Austin petitioned for favour to be shewed to the Circumcellions, it was, he thought, for the honour of the Church, to free her from the suspicion and charge of revenge and cruelty, which the Donatists were so

[34] Ep. 2. [al. 52.] ad Nepotian. p. 15. (t. 1. p. 263 e. n. 11.) Quod si obtenderis te facere hæc, ut roges pro miseris atque subjectis; judex sæculi plus deferet clerico continenti, quam diviti, et magis sanctitatem tuam venerabitur, quam opes.

[35] L. 7. c. 17. (v. 2. p. 362. 44.) Ὑπὲρ πολλῶν δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας παρεκάλει· οἱ καὶ ἑτοίμως ὑπήκουον διὰ τὴν προσοῦσαν εὐλάβειαν τῷ ἀνδρί.

[36] L. 5. c. 14. (ibid. p. 280. 25.) ....Λεοντίῳ γοῦν ἐπισκόπῳ τῆς ἐν Ῥώμῃ τῶν Ναυατιανῶν ἐκκλησίας παρακαλοῦντι χάριν διδοὺς, τὸν Σύμμαχον ἀπέλυσε τοῦ ἐγκλήματος.

ready to cast upon her; and therefore he desired Apringius[37], the proconsul, to spare them for the sake of Christ and his Church, as well as to give them time to see their error and repent of it.

They never interceded in civil matters and pecuniary causes.

3. It must further be noted from St. Ambrose, that bishops, though they themselves were sometimes chosen judges in civil causes, yet never interceded for any man in such causes to the secular judges. And he gives a very good reason[38] for it; because, 'in pecuniary causes, where two parties are concerned, a bishop could not intercede for one party, but the other would be injured, and have reason to think he lost his cause by the interest and favour of the intercessor inclining to the adverse party:' for which reason there are no examples of their interceding in such cases.

CHAP. IX.

Of some particular honours and instances of respect shewed to bishops by all persons in general.

Of the ancient custom of bowing the head, to receive the benediction of bishops.

1. There are several other privileges belonging to bishops, in common with the rest of the clergy; such as their exemptions from burdensome offices, and some sort of taxes, and the cognizance of the secular courts in some cases; of which I shall say nothing particularly here, because they will be considered when we treat of the privileges of the clergy in general. But there are two or three customs which argued a particular respect paid to bishops, and therefore I must not here wholly pass them over. One of these was the ancient custom of *bowing the head before them, to receive their blessing*,—a custom so universally prevailing, that the emperors themselves did not refuse to comply with it: as may appear from that discourse of Hilary[39] to Constantius, where he tells him, 'he entertained the bishops with a kiss, with which Christ was

[37] Ep. 160. [al. 134.] (t. 2. p. 399 a.) Illi impio ferro fuderunt sanguinem Christianum: tu ab eorum sanguine etiam juridicum gladium cohibe propter Christum..... Tu, inimicis ecclesiæ viventibus, relaxa spatium pœnitendi.

[38] De Offic. Eccles. l. 3. c. 9. (t. 2. p. 122 d.).... In causis pecuniariis intervenire non est sacerdotis; in quibus non potest fieri, quin frequenter lædatur alter qui vincitur; quoniam intercessoris beneficio se victum arbitratur.

[39] Lib. adv. Constant. [s. 10.] p. 95. (p. 570 c.) Osculo sacerdotes excipis, quo et Christus est proditus: caput benedictioni submittis, ut fidem calces.

betrayed: and bowed his head to receive their benediction, whilst he trampled on their faith.' This plainly refers to the custom we are speaking of: and by it we may understand the meaning of Theodoret, when he says[40], 'the emperor Valentinian gave orders to the bishops who were met to make choice of a bishop of Milan, that they should place such an one on the bishop's throne of that eminency for life and doctrine, that the emperors themselves might not be ashamed to bow their heads to him.' The same custom is more plainly hinted at by St. Chrysostom, in one of his Homilies[41] to the people of Antioch, where, speaking of Flavian their bishop, who was gone to the emperor to procure a pardon for them, he says, 'Flavian was a prince, and a more honourable prince than the other; forasmuch as the sacred laws made the emperor submit his head to the hands of the bishop.' He speaks of no other submission, but only this in receiving the bishop's benediction; for in other respects the priests in those days were always subject to the emperors. He that would see more proofs of this custom may consult Valesius[42], who has collected a great many passages out of other authors relating to it. I shall only add here that Rescript of Honorius and Valentinian, which says[43], 'bishops were the persons *to whom all the world bowed the head, quibus omnis terra caput inclinat.*'

[40] L. 4. c. 6. (v. 3. p. 153. 10.) ... *Ὅπως καὶ ἡμεῖς, οἱ τὴν βασιλείαν ἰθύνοντες, εἰλικρινῶς αὐτῷ τὰς ἡμετέρας ὑποκλίνοιμεν κεφαλάς.*

[41] Hom. 3. ad Pop. Antioch. (t. 2. p. 38 d.) *Ἄρχων ἐστὶ καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ ἄρχων ἐκείνου σεμνότερος· καὶ γὰρ αὐτὴν τὴν βασιλικὴν κεφαλὴν οἱ ἱεροὶ νόμοι ταῖς τούτου φέροντες χερσὶν ὑπέταξαν.*

[42] Not. in Theodor. l. 4. c. 6. (ibid. n. 1.) Solebant olim Christiani occurrentibus episcopis caput submittere, ut ab iis benedictionem acciperent. Cujus moris multa supersunt vestigia in veterum libris. Primo enim Hilarius in Libro contra Constantium ita scribit: *Osculo sacerdotes excipis, &c.* Philostorgius in Historia Ecclesiastica scribit, Leontium Tripoleos episcopum, cum reliqui omnes episcopi Eusebiam Augustam, uxorem imperatoris Constantii, adirent, eamque ex more adorarent, numquam adduci potuisse ut eam inviseret, nisi ea conditione, ut Augusta venienti ipsi adsurgeret et caput submitteret, postulans ut benediceretur. Verba Philostorgii refert Suidas in Leontio. Simile est quod scribit Marcus diaconus in Vita Porphyrii Gazensis episcopi, Eudoxiam Augustam ipsis in palatium venientibus non semel occurrisse, et priorem ipsos salutasse, atque ut sederent jussisse, et inclinato capite postulasse ut benedicerent, &c.

[43] [Ap. loc. citat. (ibid. sub fin.) Audemus quidem sermonem facere, solito plus timore capti, de sanctis et venerabilibus sacerdotibus et secundis sacerdotibus vel etiam levitis, et eos cum omni timore nominare, quibus omnis terra caput inclinat. *Grischov.*]

2. Such another customary respect was paid to them by *kissing their hand*, which seems to have accompanied the former ceremony; for St. Ambrose[44] joins them both together, saying, 'that kings and princes did not disdain to bend and bow their necks to the knees of the priests, and kiss their hands, thinking themselves protected by their prayers.' Paulinus says[45], the people paid this respect commonly to St. Ambrose. And Chrysostom, speaking of Meletius bishop of Antioch, says[46], 'at his first coming to the city the whole multitude went out to meet him, and as many as could come near him laid hold of his feet and kissed his hands.' They that please to see more of this custom may consult Sidonius Apollinaris[47], and Savaro's learned Notes[48] upon him, who cites Ennodius and several other authors to the same purpose. Of ki their

3. St. Jerom mentions another custom[49], which he condemns as doing too great an honour to mere mortal men, which was *the people's singing hosannas to their bishops*, as the multitude did to our Saviour at his entrance into Jerusalem. Valesius[50] cites a passage out of Antoninus's Itinerary to the same purpose, where the form of words is, 'Blessed be ye of the Lord, and blessed be your coming!—Hosanna in the highest!' Some also understand Hegesippus[51] in the same The c of sin hosan to th some used, not a prove

[44] De Dignit. Sacerdot. c. 2. (t. 2. append. p. 359 b.) .... Quippe cum videas regum colla et principum submitti genibus sacerdotum, et exosculata eorum dextra orationibus eorum credant se communiri.

[45] Vit. Ambros. pp. 2, 3. (t. 2. præfix. append. p. 2 b.) Cum adolevisset, et esset in urbe Roma constitutus, cum matre vidua et sorore, quæ virginitatem jam fuerat professa, comite alia virgine, cujus virginis soror Candida, et ipsa ejusdem professionis, quæ nunc Carthagine degit jam anus; cum videret sacerdotibus a domestica, sorore, vel matre manus osculari, ipse ludens offerebat dexteram, dicens et sibi id ab ea fieri oportere, siquidem episcopum se futurum esse memorabat.

[46] Hom. 45. in Melet. (t. 2. p. 521 a.) Ὅτε γοῦν πρὸς ὑμᾶς εἰσήλαυνε, καὶ πᾶσα ἡ πόλις πρὸς τὴν ὁδὸν μεθωρμίζετο, οἱ μὲν πλησίον ἤρχοντο, καὶ ποδῶν ἥπτοντο, καὶ χεῖρας κατεφίλουν.

[47] L. 8. Ep. 11. (p. 526.) .... Sancti .. Gallicini manu osculata. — L. 7. Ep. 11. (p. 455.) ... Salutatione præfata, sicut mos poscit officii, &c.

[48] In l. c. (p. 532.) Manus autem episcoporum osculari mos fuit, &c.

[49] In Matth. 21. t. 9. p. 62. (t. 7. p. 164 b.) Videant ergo episcopi, et quantumlibet sancti homines, cum quanto periculo dici ista sibi patiantur, &c.

[50] Not. in Euseb. l. 2. c. 23. (v. 1. p. 79. n. 2.) Benedicti vos a Domino, benedictusque adventus vester, Osanna in excelsis.

[51] Ap. Euseb. ibid. (v. 1. p. 79. 27.) .... Καὶ πολλῶν πληροφορηθέντων καὶ δοξαζόντων ἐπὶ τῇ μαρτυρίᾳ τοῦ Ἰακώβου, καὶ λεγόντων, Ὡσαννὰ τῷ υἱῷ Δαβίδ, κ. τ. λ.

sense, where, speaking of the preaching of James, bishop of Jerusalem, he says, 'the people that were converted by his discourse cried out, *Hosanna to the Son of David!*' Scaliger understands that as spoken to James himself; but others[52] take it for a doxology, or acclamation to Christ, whom they glorified upon the testimony that James had given him: and this seems to be the truer sense of that place. However, in the other acceptation, there is nothing contrary to custom in it, as appears from what has been said. I do not insist upon what St. Jerom in another place[53] says further of this bishop of Jerusalem, 'that he was a man of such celebrated fame among the people for his great sanctity, that they ambitiously strove to touch the hem of his garment.' For this honour was not paid him as a bishop, but as a most holy man, who was indeed, according to the character given him by Hegesippus[54] and Epiphanius[55], a man of singular abstinence and piety, and one of the miracles of the age he lived in. So that this was a singular honour done to him for his singular holiness and virtue.

4. But to proceed with the common honours paid to bishops. Another instance of respect may be observed in the usual forms of addressing them: for when men spake to them they commonly prefaced their discourse with some title of honour, such as that of *precor coronam*, and *per coronam vestram*, which we may English, *your honour and dignity*, literally,

[52] Grabe, Spicileg. Sæc. 2. (t. ii. p. 207.) translates it thus: Cumque multi hoc Jacobi testimonio confirmati glorificarent [Jesum,] dicentes, Hosanna Filio David.

[53] In Gal. 1. (t. 7. p. 396 d.) .... Jacobus episcopus Hierosolymorum primus fuit, cognomento Justus; vir tantæ sanctitatis et rumoris in populo, ut fimbriam vestimenti ejus certatim cuperent attingere.

[54] [Ap. Euseb. ut supr. (v. 1. p. 78. 7.) Οὗτος δὲ ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ ἅγιος ἦν. οἶνον καὶ σίκερα οὐκ ἔπινεν, οὐδὲ ἔμψυχον ἔφαγε. Ξυρὸν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἀνέβη, ἔλαιον οὐκ ἠλείψατο, καὶ βαλανείῳ οὐκ ἐχρήσατο. τούτῳ μόνῳ ἐξῆν εἰς τὰ ἅγια εἰσιέναι. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐρεοῦν ἐφόρει, ἀλλὰ σινδόνας. Καὶ μόνος εἰσήρχετο εἰς τὸν ναὸν, ηὑρίσκετό τε κείμενος ἐπὶ τοῖς γόνασι, καὶ αἰτούμενος ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ ἄφεσιν, ὡς ἀπεσκληκέναι τὰ γόνατα αὐτοῦ δίκην καμήλου, διὰ τὸ ἀεὶ κάμπτειν προσκυνοῦντα τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ αἰτεῖσθαι ἄφεσιν τῷ λαῷ. Διὰ γέτοι τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ, ἐκαλεῖτο δίκαιος καὶ ὠβλίας· ὅ ἐστιν Ἑλληνιστὶ περιοχὴ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ δικαιοσύνη, ὡς οἱ προφῆται δηλοῦσι περὶ αὐτοῦ. Ed.]

[55] [Hær. 78. Antidicomar. n. 7. (t. 1. p. 1039 b.) Ἔσχε μὲν οὖν πρωτότοκον τὸν Ἰάκωβον τὸν ἐπικληθέντα Ὠβλίαν, ἑρμηνευόμενον τεῖχος, καὶ δίκαιον ἐπικληθέντα. Ναζωραῖον δὲ ὄντα, ὅπερ ἑρμηνεύεται ἅγιος. — It. nn. 13. 14. (pp. 1045 c. 1046 b.) Conf. Suicer. Thes. Eccles. (t. 2. p. 1593.) in voce, Ὠβλίας. Ed.]

your crown. This form often occurs in Sidonius Apollinaris[56], Ennodius[57], St. Jerom[58], and others. St. Austin says[59], both the Catholics and Donatists used it when they spake to the bishops of either party, giving them very respectful titles, and intreating, or rather adjuring them, *per coronam*, that they would hear and determine their secular causes.

Whether bishops anciently wore a mitre or any the like ornament.

5. The use of this form of speech then is plain; but the reason of it is not so evident. Savaro[60] and some others[61] fancy it respected the ancient figure of the clerical tonsure, by which the hair was cut into a round, from the crown of the head downwards. Others think it came from the ornament which bishops wore upon their heads, and that they will needs have to be *a crown* or *mitre*, whereas it does not appear that bishops had any such ornament in those days. I know, indeed, both Valesius[62] and Petavius[63] are very confident, that all

[56] Lib. 6. Ep. 3. (p. 385.) Hunc catenus commendare præsumo, ut si eum instruere dignanter advocatio consulta fastidit, auctoritas coronæ tuæ dissimulantibus studeat excudere responsi celeritatem. — L. 7. Ep. 8. ad Euphron. (p. 439.) De minimis rebus coronam tuam maximisque consulerem.

[57] L. 4. Ep. 29. ad Symmach. (ap. Bibl. Max. [Ep. 22.] t. 9. p. 338 h. 10.) .... Ut erigat parvulos implorata coronæ vestræ miseratio. — L. 5. Ep. 10. ad Eund. (p. 343 c.) Parthenius igitur, præsentium portitor, germanæ filius, hac ad coronam vestram fiducia animante directus est. — L. 6. Ep. 17. ad Marcellin. (p. 348 c. 8.) Fiduciæ meæ coronam vestram non ambigo responsuram. — L. 9. Ep. 27. ad Aurel. (p. 368 h. 3.) O si mihi liceret adhuc æquali cum beatitudine tuam sortem contendere, sed dormiunt apud coronam tuam propinquitatis privilegia.

[58] Ep. 26. ad August. inter Epp. August. [int. Epp. Hieron. Ed. Vallars. Ep. 142.] (t. 1. p. 1060 c.) Precor coronam tuam.

[59] Ep. 147. [al. 33.] ad Proculeian. Episc. Partis Donati. (t. 2. p. 63 f.) Honorant nos vestri, honorant vos nostri. Per coronam nostram nos adjurant vestri; per coronam vestram vos adjurant nostri.

[60] In Sidon. Apollin. l. 6. Ep. 3. (p. 386.) Et tonsura clerica et episcopalis corona, &c.

[61] Baron. An. 58. n. 134. (t. 1. p. 570 d.) Episcopos etiam magna saltem ex parte capitis abrasos fuisse, satis expressisse visus est Gregorius Nazianzenus, qui agens adversus Maximum ex cynico philosopho mox factum episcopum, hæc ait: Cum ad pastoralis muneris administrationem nihil aliud omnino contulerint, quam quod comam, cui alendæ et ornandæ turpiter studuerant, raserint. Porro quoniam ejusmodi capitis rasionem consuevisse a majoribus dici coronam, ea quæ dicta sunt superius, satis aperte significant: ad hujusmodi coronam vel aliud ornamentum capitis .... allusisse videtur Eusebius Pamphili in ea oratione panegyrica, quam habuit in dedicatione ecclesiæ a Paulino Tyri episcopo ædificatæ, cum sic exorditur: Amici Dei et sacerdotes, qui sacrosancto poderis indumento, cœlesti gloriæ corona .. circumvestiti.

[62] Not. in Euseb. l. 5. c. 24. (p. 243. n. 4.) Quod autem de lamina dicit Polycrates, credibile est, primos illos Christianorum ponti-

bishops from the very first had an appendant badge of honour in their foreheads, which they say was the same with the *petalum*, or *golden plate*, which the Jewish high priests wore. And it cannot be denied, but that as ancient an author as Polycrates[64], mentioned both by Eusebius and St. Jerom, says, that St. John was a priest, wearing a *petalum*. And Epiphanius[65] says the same of James, bishop of Jerusalem. But this was not spoken of them as Christian bishops, but on presumption of their having been Jewish priests, and of the family of Aaron. Valesius himself cites a MS. Passion of St. Mark, which sets the same ornament on his head, and gives this very reason for it. 'It is reported,' says he[66], 'that St. Mark, according to the rites of the carnal sacrifice, wore the chief priest's *petalum* among the Jews; which gives us plainly to understand,' says that author, 'that he was one of the tribe of Levi, and of the family of Aaron.' So he did not take this for the ornament of a Christian bishop, but a Jewish priest; and that opens the way for us to understand what the other authors meant by it, however Valesius chanced not to observe it. Now if it cannot be proved that bishops anciently wore any such ornament as this, it will much less follow that they wore a royal crown or mitre, as Spondanus[67] asserts they did, and

fices, exemplo Judaicorum pontificum, hoc honoris insigne gestasse. Certe et Jacobum, fratrem Domini, qui primus Hierosolymis episcopus ordinatus est, pontificalem laminam in fronte gestasse auctor est Epiphanius in Hæresi Nazaræorum et in Hæresi 78.

[63] Animadv. in Epiph. Hær. 78. Antidicomar. n. 14. (t. 2. p. 333.) Quod de summi pontificis πετάλῳ accepisse videtur. Perperam id quidem: quod alioqui de Christianorum pontificum insigni credibile est, et de Joanne evangelista testatum reliquit Polycrates apud Euseb. l. 5. c. 23. [24.] ὃς ἐγενήθη ἱερεὺς τὸ πέταλον πεφορεκώς. De Jacobo haud scio an quispiam prodiderit. Nam quos Hæresi 29. citat Epiphanius, de Joanne, non Jacobo ista scripserunt.

[64] Ap. Euseb. l. 5. c. 24. (ibid. p. 243. 2.) Ἔτι δὲ καὶ Ἰωάννης, ὁ ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος τοῦ Κυρίου ἀναπεσὼν, ὃς ἐγενήθη ἱερεὺς τὸ πέταλον πεφορεκὼς, καὶ μάρτυς καὶ διδάσκαλος· κ. τ. λ.

[65] Hær. 29. Nazar. n. 4. (t. 1. p. 119 b.) Ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ πέταλον ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἐξῆν αὐτῷ φέρειν, κ. τ. λ. — Hær. 78. Antidicomar. n. 14. (t. 1. p. 1046 a.) Οὗτος ὁ Ἰάκωβος καὶ πέταλον ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἐφόρεσε.

[66] Auct. MS. Pass. S. Marc. ap. Vales. ibid. (v. 1. p. 243. n. 4.) B. Marcum, juxta ritum carnalis sacrificii, pontificalis apicis petalum in populo gestasse Judæorum, illustrium virorum syngraphæ declarant: ex quo manifeste datur intelligi, de stirpe eum Levitica, immo pontificis Aaron sacræ successionis originem habuisse.

[67] Epit. Baron. An. 58. n. 54. (t. 1. p. 131.) .... Hincque est, ut, (quoniam ejusmodi capitis rationem consuevisse a majoribus dici *coronam*, ea quæ dicta sunt satis aperte significant) consueto more loquendi, soleret populus, cum episcopum inter-

thence deduces the custom of addressing them *per coronam;* therein deserting his great master, Baronius, who assigns another reason for it[68]. After all, it seems most probable that it was no more than a metaphorical expression, used to denote the honour and dignity of the episcopal order; though I do not deny that the clerical tonsure was sometimes called *corona;* but that was not peculiar to bishops, but common to all the clergy.

6. It will not be improper to add, while we are upon this point, that it was usual in men's addresses to bishops, or in speaking of them, to mention their names with some additional titles of respect, such as θεοφιλέστατοι and ἁγιώτατοι, *most dear to God,* and *most holy fathers;* which titles occur frequently in the emperor's rescripts in the Civil Law[69], and were of such common use in those times, that Socrates, when he comes to the sixth book of his History, which treats of his own times, thinks himself obliged to make some apology[70] for not giving the bishops, that were then living, these titles. Which I the rather note, because of the vanity of some, who reckon the title *Most Holy Father* the Pope's sole prerogative; and to correct the malice of others, who will not allow a protestant bishop to receive that title, without the suspicion and imputation of popery. As if St. Austin and St. Jerom had been to blame, because the one wrote and the other received epistles always thus inscribed,—*Domino vere sancto, et beatissimo Papæ Augustino.* See St. Austin's Epist. 11, 13, 14, 17, 18, 25, [al. 75, 68, 72, 39, 81, 195.] where St. Jerom and others gave him those honourable titles.

Of the titl ἁγιώτατο sanctissi &c.

7. There is one thing more that must not be omitted, because it was the common honour and privilege of all bishops, to be distin-

Bishops d tinguishe by their

pellaret, et enixius aliquid ab eo peteret, *per coronam* ipsius obtestari.

[68] See n. 61 preceding.

[69] Justin. Novel. 40. (t. 5. p. 249 ad calc.) Idem Imp. Petro sanctissimo, et beatissimo archiepiscopo Hierosolymorum.—Novel. 42. (p. 252.) Imp. Cæsar, &c. Mennæ sanctissimo et beatissimo archiepiscopo, &c.—Conf. Novel. 67. (p. 317 ad calc.) Novel. 86. cc. 1—4. (pp. 393, 394.) Adire suum ss. episcopum — Jubemus ss. archiepiscopum — Ss. civitatis episcopum adeat — Ss. episcopo satisface. — Deo amabilis episcopus.—et passim. —C. Chalced. Act. 10. (t. 4. p. 667 a.) *Διδασκαλία καὶ παράκλησις τοῖς θεοφιλεστάτοις καὶ ὁσιωτάτοις ἐπισκόποις Φωτίῳ καὶ Εὐσταθίῳ παρὰ παντὸς τοῦ κλήρου τῆς Ἐδεσσηνῶν μητροπόλεως.*

[70] Socrat. Procem. ad l. 6. (v. 2. p. 307. 36.) *Οἱ μὲν ἐκκλησιῶν ζηλωταὶ καταγνώσονται, ὅτι μὴ τοὺς ἐπισκόπους λέγομεν θεοφιλεστάτους, ἢ ἁγιωτάτους, ἢ τὰ τοιαῦτα.*

guished in the Church by a chair or seat, which was commonly
h. called *their throne.* Thus Eusebius[71] calls the bishop of Jerusalem's seat *θρόνον ἀποστολικὸν, the apostolical throne,* because St. James, bishop of Jerusalem, first sat in it. And, for the same reason, Gregory Nazianzen[72] calls the bishop of Alexandria's seat 'the throne of St. Mark.' It was otherwise called *βῆμα* and *θρόνος ὑψηλὸς, the high throne,* because it was exalted something higher than the seats of the presbyters, which were on each side of it, and were called *the second thrones;* as we shall see hereafter, when we come to speak of presbyters. All that I shall observe further here concerning this throne of the bishops is, that, though it be sometimes called *the high and lofty throne,* especially by those writers[73] who speak in a rhetorical strain, yet that is only meant comparatively, in respect of the lower seats of presbyters. For otherwise, it was a fault in any bishop to build himself a pompous and splendid throne, in imitation of the state and grandeur of the secular magistrates. This was one of the crimes which the Council of Antioch[74], in their Synodical Epistle against Paulus Samosatensis, laid to his charge, that he built himself a high and stately tribunal, not as a disciple of Christ, but as one of the rulers of the world; making a *secretum* to it, in imitation of the secular magistrates, whose tribunals had a place railed out from the rest, and separated by a veil, which they called the *secretum,* and the ambitious bishop gave his the same name; by which, and some other such like practices, he raised the envy and hatred of the heathens against the Christians, as they there complain of him. It was then the great care of the Christian Church, to observe a decorum in the

[71] l. 7. c. 19. (v. 1. p. 343. 23.) Τὸν γὰρ Ἰακώβου θρόνον, τοῦ πρώτου τῆς Ἱεροσολύμων ἐκκλησίας τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν παρὰ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Σωτῆρος καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑποδεξαμένου, κ. τ. λ. [Conf. l. 7. c. 32. (ibid. p. 372. 23. . . . Ἕρμων ὕπατος . . . . ἀποστολικὸν διαδέχεται θρόνον Grischov.]

[72] Orat. 21. in Laud. Athanas. (t. 1. p. 377 c.) Οὐδὲ φοινικῶς τε καὶ τυραννικῶς, ἀλλ' ἀποστολικῶς τε καὶ πνευματικῶς, ἐπὶ τὸν Μάρκου θρόνον ἀνείγεται.

[73] Somn. de Eccles. Anastas. (t. 2. p. 78 b.) Ἐζέσθαι δοκέεσκον ὑπέρθρονος, κ. τ. λ. — Orat. 20. in Laud. Basil. (t. 1. p. 342 d.) Ἄρτι τοῦ φερωνύμου τῆς εὐσεβείας μετατεθέντος, καὶ ταῖς ἐκείνου χερσὶν ἡδέως ἐναποψύξαντος, ἐπὶ τὸν ὑψηλὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς θρόνον ἀνάγεται.

[74] Ap. Euseb. l. 7. c. 30. (v. 1. p. 361. 17.) . . . . . Βῆμα καὶ θρόνον ὑψηλὸν ἑαυτῷ κατασκευασάμενος, οὐχ ὡς Χριστοῦ μαθητὴς, σήκρυτον [leg. σήκρητον] δὲ, ὥσπερ οἱ κόσμου ἄρχοντες, ἔχων τε καὶ ὀνομάζων. κ. τ. λ.

honours which she bestowed upon her bishops, that they might be such as might set them above contempt, but to keep them below envy; make them venerable, but not minister to vanity or the outward pomp and ostentation of secular greatness.

CHAP. X.

Of the age and some particular qualifications required in such as were to be ordained bishops.

Bishops not to be ordained under thirty years of age, except they were men of extraordinary worth.

1. Those qualifications of bishops, which were common to them with the rest of the clergy, shall be spoken of hereafter; here I shall only take notice of a few that were more peculiar to them. Such as first *their age*, which by the canons was required to be at least *thirty years*. The Council of Neocæsarea[75] requires thirty in presbyters; which is a certain argument that the same age was requisite in a bishop. The Council of Agde[76] more expressly limits their age to that time, requiring all metropolitans to insist upon it in their ordination. The reasons given by these Councils are, because our Saviour himself did not begin to teach before he was thirty years old, and because that is the perfect age of man; therefore, though a man was otherwise never so well qualified, the Council of Neocæsarea says, 'he shall wait, and not be ordained so much as presbyter before that time.' But whether this rule was always observed from the days of the Apostles may be questioned; for there is no such rule given by the Apostles in Scripture. That which goes under their name in the Constitutions[77] requires a bishop to be fifty years old before he is ordained; except he be a man of singular merit and worth, which may compensate for the want of years. This shews that the custom of the Church varied in this matter, and that persons of extraordinary qualifications were not always tied to be

[75] C. 11. (t. 1. p. 1484 a.) Πρεσβύτερος πρὸ τῶν τριάκοντα ἐτῶν μὴ χειροτονείσθω.

[76] C. 17. (t. 4. p. 1386 b.) Presbyterum vero vel episcopum ante triginta annos, id est, antequam ad viri perfecti ætatem perveniat, nullus metropolitanorum ordinare præsumat.—See also C. Tolet. 4. c. 19. (t. 5. p. 1711 e.) Qui nondum ad triginta annos pervenerunt, &c.

[77] Constit. Apost. l. 2. c. 1. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 213.) .... Τὸν ποιμένα τὸν καθιστάμενον ἐπίσκοπον .. δεῖ ὑπάρχειν .. οὐκ ἔλαττον ἐτῶν πεντήκοντα· .. εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐν παροικίᾳ μικρᾷ ὑπαρχούσῃ που προβεβηκὼς τῷ χρόνῳ μὴ εὑρίσκηται μεμαρτυρημένος ὑπὸ τῶν συνόντων αὐτῷ ὡς ἄξιος ἐπισκοπῆς, διὰ τῆς νεότητος ἐν πραότητι καὶ εὐταξίᾳ γῆρας ἐπιδεικνύμενος δοκιμασθεὶς, εἰ ὑπὸ τῶν τοιούτων μαρτυρεῖται, καθιστάσθω ἐν εἰρήνῃ.

of such an age. Timothy was ordained young, as may be collected from what the Apostle says to him, 1 Tim. 4, 12., "Let no man despise thy youth." The history of the Church affords many other such instances. Eusebius[78] says Gregory Thaumaturgus and his brother Athenodorus were both ordained bishops *very young*,—*ἔτι νέους ἄμφω*. St. Ambrose[79] says the same of Acholius, bishop of Thessalonica, 'that he was young in years, but of mature age in respect of his virtues.' And Socrates[80] gives the like account of Paulus, bishop of Constantinople. Theodoret[81] observes also of Athanasius, 'that he was but young when he attended his bishop Alexander at the Council of Nice,' and yet within five months after he was chosen his successor at Alexandria, which probably was before he was thirty years old. For the Council of Nice was not above twenty years after the persecution under Maximian; and yet Athanasius was so young as not to remember the beginning of that persecution, anno 303, but only as he heard it from his fathers. For when he speaks of it, he says[82], 'he learned of his parents, that the persecution was raised by Maximian, grandfather to Constantius.' So that if we compute from that time, we can hardly suppose him to be thirty years old when he was ordained bishop, anno 326. It is agreed by all authors[83] that Remigius, bishop of Rhemes, was but twenty-two years old when he was ordained, anno 471. And Cotelerius[84],

[78] L. 6. c. 30. (v. 1. p. 295. 5.) .... *Πέντε δὲ ὅλοις ἔτεσιν αὐτῷ συγγενόμενοι, τοσαύτην ἀπηνέγκαντο περὶ τὰ θεῖα λόγια βελτίωσιν, ὡς ἔτι νέους ἄμφω ἐπισκοπῆς τῶν κατὰ Πόντον ἐκκλησιῶν ἀξιωθῆναι.*

[79] Ep. 60. [al. 16.] ad Anysium. (t. 2. p. 823 b.) Benedictus etiam processus juventutis ipsius, in qua ad summum electus est sacerdotium, maturo jam probatus virtutum stipendio.

[80] L. 2. c. 6. (v. 2. p. 83. 13.) ... *Ἐνετείλατο δὲ τοῖς καθήκουσιν ἑλέσθαι δυοῖν τὸν ἕτερον, ὧν αὐτὸς ὀνομάσειεν· καὶ εἰ μὲν βούλοιντο διδασκαλικὸν ἐν τιμῇ καὶ βίου χρηστοῦ μαρτυρούμενον, Παῦλον τὸν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ χειροτονηθέντα πρεσβύτερον, ἄνδρα νέον μὲν τὴν ἡλικίαν, προβεβηκότα δὲ ταῖς φρονήσεσιν.*

[81] L. 1. c. 26. (v. 3. p. 59. 4.) *Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ θαυμασίου ἐπισκόπου, .. τοῦ βίου τὸ τέρμα κατειληφότος, .. τὴν τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων ἐκκλησίας Ἀθανάσιος διεδέξατο προεδρίαν· .. συνῆν δὲ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τῷ πάνυ, νέος μὲν ὢν τὴν ἡλικίαν, τοῦ χοροῦ δὲ τῶν διακόνων ἡγούμενος.*

[82] Ep. ad Solitar. Vit. Agent. (t. i. part 1. p. 302 b. n. 64.) .... *Ἐγὼ γὰρ ἤκουσα τῶν πατέρων, καὶ πιστὸν ἡγοῦμαι τὸν ἐκείνων λόγον, ὅτι, κ.τ.λ.*

[83] Hincmar. Vit. Remig. ap. Baron. an. 471. (t. 6. p. 300 d.) Cum Remigius ad viginti et duos ætatis annos pervenit, defuncto Gennadio archiepiscopo, in hac urbe Rhemensi, omnium generaliter votis ad pontificii culmen raptus fuisse dignoscitur potius quam electus.

[84] Not. in Constit. Apost. l. 2. c. 1. (v. 1. p. 213.) .. Exemplis præcipue S. Eleutherii Illyrici apud Nicepho-

after Nicephorus, says St. Eleutherius, an Illyrican bishop, was consecrated at twenty. Ignatius gives a plain intimation, that Damas, bishop of the Magnesians, was but a very young bishop, though he does not expressly mention his age. He calls his ordination[85] *νεωτερικὴν τάξιν, a youthful ordination;* and therefore cautions the people not to despise him for his age, but to reverence and give place to him in the Lord. Salmasius and Ludovicus Capellus[86] miserably pervert this passage, and force a sense upon it which the author never so much as dreamt of. They will needs have it, that by the words *νεωτερικὴν τάξιν* Ignatius means *the novelty of episcopacy in general*, that it was but a new and late institution: which is not only contrary to the whole tenour and design of all Ignatius's Epistles, but to the plain sense of this passage in particular; which speaks nothing of the institution of episcopacy, but of the age of this bishop, who was but young when he was ordained.

Now, from all this it appears, that though there was a rule in the Church requiring bishops to be thirty years old when they were ordained, yet it was frequently dispensed with, either in cases of necessity, or in order to promote persons of more extraordinary worth and singular qualifications. Yet such dispensations, as qualify boys of eleven or twelve years old to be made bishops, are nowhere to be met with in the primitive Church; though the history of the Papacy affords frequent instances of such promotions; as those that please may see in a catalogue of them, collected by Dr. Reynolds and Mr. Mason, two learned writers of our Church[87].

rum, Histor. l. 3. c. 29, et S. Remigii Remensis in Vit. illius; quorum primus annum agens 20, alter 22, ad summum sacerdotium provecti fuere.—Conf. Niceph. l. 3. c. 29. (t. 1. p. 263 d. 4.) Τῷ δ' αὐτῷ χρόνῳ καὶ ὁ πολὺς τὴν ἀρετὴν κατὰ τὸ Ἰλλυρικὸν διέτριβεν ὁ Ἐλευθέριος... ....καὶ τῷ εἰκοστῷ ἔτει τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ ἐπίσκοπος προχειρίζεται.

[85] Ep. ad Magnes. n. 3. (Cotel. v. 2. p. 18.) Καὶ ὑμῖν δὲ πρέπει μὴ συγκρᾶσθαι τῇ ἡλικίᾳ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, ἀλλὰ κατὰ δύναμιν Θεοῦ Πατρὸς πᾶσαν ἐντροπὴν αὐτῷ ἀπονέμειν, καθὼς ἔγνων καὶ τοὺς ἁγίους πρεσβυτέρους, οὐ προσειληφότας τὴν φαινομένην νεωτερικὴν τάξιν, ἀλλ' ὡς φρονίμους ἐν Θεῷ συγχωροῦντας αὐτῷ· οὐκ αὐτῷ δὲ, ἀλλὰ τῷ Πατρὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τῷ πάντων ἐπισκόπῳ.

[86] Ap. Pearson, Vind. Ignat. Præf. ad Lect. (Cotel. ibid. p. 238.)

[87] Vid. Rainold. Apol. Thes. n. 26. (p. 292.) Premamus antichristi potius satellitem ecclesia sua Romana, quæ papam habuit puerum duodecim annorum, &c.—It. Mason, of the Consecration of Bishops, b. 1. ch. 5. (p. 27.) But the bishop of Rome maketh boy-priests, and boy-bishops, and boy-cardinals, &c.

2. But to return to the bishops of the primitive Church. Another qualification in a bishop anciently very much insisted on was, that he should be *one of the clergy of the same church over which he was to be made bishop.* For strangers, who were unknown to the people, were not reckoned qualified by the canons. This is plainly implied by Cyprian[88], when he says, 'the bishop was to be chosen in the presence of the people, who had perfect knowledge of every man's life and actions by their conversation among them.' St. Jerom observes[89], 'that this was the constant custom of Alexandria, from St. Mark to Dionysius and Heraclas, for the presbyters of the Church to choose a bishop out of their own body.' And therefore Julius[90] makes it a strong objection against Gregory, whom the Arians obtruded on the Church of Alexandria in the room of Athanasius, 'that he was a perfect stranger to the place, neither baptized there, nor known to any: whereas, the ordination of a bishop ought not to be so uncanonical; but he should be ordained by the bishops of the province in his own church, and be *ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἱερατείου, ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ κλήρου, one of the clergy of the church to which he was ordained.*' The ancient bishops of Rome were all of the same mind, so long as they thought themselves obliged to walk by the laws of the Church; for Celestin[91], and Hilary[92], and Leo[93], insist

[88] Ep. 68. [al. 67.] ad Fratr. Hispan. p. 172. (p. 289.)...Episcopus deligatur plebe præsente, quæ singulorum vitam plenissime novit, et uniuscujusque actum de ejus conversatione perspexit.

[89] Ep. 85. [al. 146.] ad Evagr. [Evang.] (t. 1. p. 1076 b. n. 1.) Alexandriæ, a Marco evangelista usque ad Heraclam et Dionysium episcopos, presbyteri semper unum ex se electum, in excelsiori gradu collocatum, episcopum nominabant.

[90] Ep. ad Oriental. ap. Athanas. Apol. 2. t. 1. p. 749. (t. 1. part 1. 117 d. n. 30.) *Ἀποσταλῆναι Γρηγόριον, ξένον μὲν τῆς πόλεως, μήτε ἐκεῖ βαπτισθέντα, μήτε γινωσκόμενον τοῖς πολλοῖς, μὴ αἰτηθέντα παρὰ πρεσβυτέρων, μὴ παρ' ἐπισκόπων, μὴ παρὰ λαῶν'.. οὐκ ἔδει τὴν κατάστασιν οὕτως παρανόμως καὶ παρὰ τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κανόνα γενέσθαι, ἀλλ' ἀπ' αὐτῆς τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἱερατείου, ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ κλήρου τοὺς ἐν τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ ἐπισκόπους ἔδει [ἔδει] καταστῆσαι.*

[91] Ep. 2. ad Episc. Narbon. c. 4. (CC. t. 2. p. 1620 e.) Alter in alterius provincia nihil præsumat: nec emeritis in suis ecclesiis clericis peregrini et extranei, et qui ante ignorati sint, ad exclusionem eorum, qui bene de suorum civium merentur testimonio, præponantur. — Ibid. c. 5. (p. 1621 a.) Tunc alter de altera eligatur ecclesia, si de civitatis ipsius clericis, cui est episcopus ordinandus, nullus dignus, quod evenire non credimus, poterit reperiri.

[92] Ep. 2. ad Ascan. Tarracon. c. 3. (CC. t. 4. p. 1036 b.).... Talis protinus de clero proprio Barcinonensibus episcopus ordinetur.

[93] Ep. 84. ad Anastas. c. 6. (CC.

upon the same thing as the common rule and canon of the Church. And we find a law as late as Charles the Great and Ludovicus Pius to the same purpose. For in one of their Capitulars[94] it is ordered, 'that bishops shall be chosen out of their own diocese, by the election of the clergy and the people.' Though, as Baluzius[95] notes, this law did not extend to very many dioceses: for by this time the French kings had the disposal of all bishoprics in their dominions, except some few churches, which by special privilege retained the old way of electing; and they did not bind themselves to nominate bishops always out of the clergy of that church which was vacant, but used their liberty to choose them out of any other: as now it is become the privilege and custom of kings and princes almost in all nations, which is the occasion of the difference betwixt the ancient and modern practice in this particular. For while the ancient way of elections continued, the general rule was for every church to make choice of one of her own clergy to be her bishop, and not a stranger.

Some exceptions to this rule.

3. Yet in some extraordinary cases this rule admitted of legal exceptions; particularly in these three cases. 1. When it was found for the benefit of the Church to translate bishops from one see to another. In this case, though the bishop was a stranger, yet his translation, being canonical, was reckoned no violation of this law. 2. When the Church could not unanimously agree upon one in their own body, then, to pacify their heats and end their controversies, the emperor or a Council proposed one of another church to their choice, or promoted him by their own authority. Upon this ground, Nec-

t. 3. p. 1385 c.) Metropolitano vero defuncto, cum in locum ejus alius fuerit subrogandus, provinciales episcopi ad civitatem metropolitanam convenire debebunt, ut omnium clericorum atque omnium civium voluntate discussa, ex presbyteris ejusdem ecclesiæ, vel ex diaconibus optimus eligatur.

[94] L. 1. Capitul. 84. [78. juxt. Capitul. Reg. Franc. Par. 1677. t. 1. p. 718.] Vid. ap. Baluz. ad CC. Gall. Narbon. (Notar. p. 34.) ... Ut scilicet episcopi per electionem cleri et populi secundum statuta canonum de propria diœcesi, remota personarum et munerum acceptione, ob vitæ meritum et sapientiæ donum eligantur, &c.

[95] Not. ad CC. Gall. Narbon. (ibid.) Ego animadverto, eam [legem] non fuisse observatam, ac nihilominus reges dedisse episcopatus in universum; si paucas quasdam ecclesias excipias, quibus ex speciali privilegio concessum est, ut vacantibus ecclesiis provideretur per electionem.—It. Not. ad Gratian. Distinct. 63. c. 34. p. 467. (ap. Oper. Ant. August. t. 3. p. 178.) .... Eam legem non fuisse observatam, &c.

tarius. Chrysostom, and Nestorius, all strangers, were made bishops of Constantinople. It was to end the disputes that arose in the Church, which was divided in their elections, as Socrates[96] and Sozomen[97] give an account of them. 3. Sometimes men's extraordinary merit gave them preference, though strangers, before all the members of the Church to which they were chosen. As St. Ambrose[98] observes of Eusebius Vercellensis, that he was chosen, '*posthabitis civibus, before all that were citizens, or bred in the place*, though none of the electors had ever seen him before, but only heard of his fame and character:' and there are many other instances of the like nature. But excepting some such cases as these, the rule was generally observed, to choose no one bishop of any place who was not known to the people and a member of the same church before.

4. Another qualification required in a bishop was, that he should arise gradually to his honour, and not come to the throne *per saltum;* but first pass through some, if not all, the inferior orders of the Church. The Council of Sardica[99] has a

[96] L. 6. c. 2. (v. 2. p. 309. 13.) Ὀλίγου δὲ διελθόντος χρόνου, καὶ Νεκτάριος, ὁ τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐπίσκοπος, ἐτελεύτησεν.... εὐθὺς οὖν σπουδὴ περὶ χειροτονίας ἐπισκόπου ἐγίνετο· καὶ ἄλλων ἄλλον ἐπιζητούντων, περί τε τούτου πολλάκις προτεθείσης βουλῆς, τέλος ἐδόκει ἐκ τῆς Ἀντιοχείας μεταπέμπεσθαι Ἰωάννην, τὸν τῆς Ἀντιοχείας πρεσβύτερον· φήμη γὰρ ἐκράτει περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὡς εἴη διδακτικὸς ἐν ταὐτῷ καὶ ἐλλόγιμος, κ.τ.λ.—L. 7. c. 29. (ibid. p. 377. 34.) Μετὰ δὲ τὴν τελευτὴν Σισιννίου ἐδόκει.. μηδένα ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας εἰς τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν προχειρίζεσθαι...ἐπήλυδα δὲ ἐκ τῆς Ἀντιοχείας καλεῖν ἐβούλοντο· ἦν γάρ τις ἐκεῖ Νεστόριος... Τριμήνου οὖν διαδραμόντος, ἄγεται ἐκ τῆς Ἀντιοχείας ὁ Νεστόριος, κ.τ.λ.

[97] L. 8. c. 2. (ibid. p. 325. 35.) .. ..Νεκταρίου τελευτήσαντος, καὶ βουλῆς οὔσης τίνα δέοι χειροτονεῖν, ἄλλοι μὲν ἄλλους ἐψηφίζοντο· καὶ οὐ τὰ αὐτὰ πᾶσιν ἐδόκει, καὶ ὁ χρόνος ἐτρίβετο. Ἦν δέ τις ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τῇ παρ' Ὀρόντῃ πρεσβίτερος, ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰωάννης....Ἐπίσημος (p. 327. 15.) οὖν τοῖς μὲν εἰδόσι τῇ πείρᾳ, τοῖς δὲ ἀγνοοῦσι τῇ φήμῃ, ἔκ τε τῶν λόγων καὶ τῶν ἔργων γενόμενος ἀνὰ πᾶσαν τὴν Ῥωμαίων ὑπήκοον, ἔδοξε Κωνσταντινουπόλει ἐπιτήδειος εἶναι τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπισκοπεῖν.

[98] Ep. 82. [al. 63.] ad Eccles. Vercel. (t. 2. p. 1023 a. nn. 1, 2.) Nam cum sint in vobis dissensiones, quomodo possumus aliquid aut nos decernere, aut vos eligere, aut quisquam acquiescere, ut inter dissidentes suscipiat hoc munus, quod inter convenientes vix sustinetur? Hæc est illa confessoris institutio, hæc justorum soboles patrum, qui sanctum Eusebium, quem numquam ante cognoverant, posthabitis civibus, simul ut viderunt et probaverunt.

[99] C. 10. (t. 2. p. 636 b.) Ὥστε ἐάν τις πλούσιος.. ἢ σχολαστικὸς ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγορᾶς ἀξιοῖτο ἐπίσκοπος γίνεσθαι, μὴ πρότερον καθίστασθαι, ἐὰν μὴ καὶ ἀναγνώστου, καὶ διακόνου, καὶ πρεσβυτέρου ὑπηρεσίαν ἐκτελέσῃ· ἵνα καθ' ἕκαστον βαθμὸν, ἐάνπερ ἄξιος νομισθείη, εἰς τὴν ἀψῖδα τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς κατὰ προκοπὴν διαβῆναι δυνηθείη· ἔξει δὲ ἑκάστου τάγματος ὁ βαθμὸς οὐκ ἐλαχίστου δηλονότι χρόνου μῆκος, δι' οὗ ἡ πίστις αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἡ τῶν τρόπων καλοκἀγαθία, καὶ ἡ στερρότης, καὶ ἡ ἐπιείκεια γνώριμος γενέσθαι δυ-

canon very full to this purpose: 'If any rich man, or pleader at the law, desire to be made a bishop, he shall not be ordained till he has first gone through the offices of reader, deacon, and presbyter; that, behaving himself worthily in each of these offices, he may ascend gradually to the height of the episcopal function; and in every one of these degrees he shall continue some considerable time, that his faith, and good conversation, and constancy, and moderation, may be known.' The same rule is prescribed by the Council of Bracara[1] and some others. And that it was the ancient practice of the Church, appears from what Cyprian says[2] of Cornelius, 'that he was not made bishop of Rome all of a sudden, but went gradually through all the offices of the Church, till his merits advanced him to the episcopal throne.' Theodoret[3] commends Athanasius upon the same account; and Gregory Nazianzen[4] speaks to the honour of St. Basil, with some reflection on several bishops of his age, 'that he did not as soon as he was baptized leap into a bishopric, as some other ambitious persons did, but rose to his honour by degrees.' He adds, 'that in military affairs, this rule was generally observed; every great general is first a common soldier, then a captain, then a commander; and it would be happy for the Church,' says he, 'if matters were always so ordered in it.' By this time it seems this rule was frequently transgressed, without any reason or necessity; but only by the ambition of some who affected the office of bishop, yet

νήσεται· καὶ αὐτὸς ἄξιος τῆς θείας ἱερωσύνης νομισθεὶς τῆς μεγίστης ἀπολαῦσαι τιμῆς.

[1] Brac. 1. c. 39. Per singulos gradus eruditus ad sacerdotium veniat. [See c. 20. of C. Brac. 2. according to Labbe (t. 5. p. 842 c.), where we read.... Ut ex laico ad gradum sacerdotii ante nemo veniat, nisi prius anno integro in officio lectorati vel subdiaconati disciplinam ecclesiasticam discat: et sic per singulos gradus prædictus ad sacerdotium veniat. Ed.]

[2] Ep. 52. [al. 55.] ad Antonian. p. 103. (p. 243.) Non iste ad episcopatum subito pervenit, sed per omnia ecclesiastica officia promotus, et in divinis administrationibus Dominum sæpe promeritus, ad sacerdotii sublime fastigium cunctis religionis gradibus ascendit.

[3] L. 1. c. 26. (v. 3. p. 59. 14.).. ..*Συνῆν δὲ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τῷ πάνυ, νέος μὲν ὢν τὴν ἡλικίαν, τοῦ χοροῦ δὲ τῶν διακόνων ἡγούμενος.*

[4] Orat. 20. in Laud. Basil. (t. 1. p. 335 b. c.) *Οὐ σχεδιάσασα τὸν βαθμὸν [ἡ πολύτροπος τοῦ Θεοῦ φιλανθρωπία,] οὐδὲ ὁμοῦ τε πλήνασα καὶ σοφίσασα κατὰ τοὺς πολλοὺς τῶν νῦν τῆς προστασίας ἐφιεμένων, ἀλλὰ τάξει καὶ νόμῳ πνευματικῆς ἀναβάσεως τῆς τιμῆς ἀξιώσασα. .... ὡς δὲ κἂν τοῖς πολεμικοῖς ἔχει, στρατιώτης, ταξίαρχος, στρατηγὸς, αὕτη ἡ τάξις ἀρίστη καὶ λυσιτελεστάτη τοῖς ἀρχομένοις· τὸ δὲ ἡμέτερον πολλοῦ ἂν ἦν ἄξιον, εἰ οὕτως εἶχε.*

were not willing to undergo the inferior offices that were preparative to it.

Deacons might be ordained bishops, though never ordained presbyters.

5. But I must observe, that it was not always necessarily required that a man should be ordained presbyter first in order to be made a bishop; for *deacons were as commonly made bishops as any other.* Cæcilian was no more than archdeacon of Carthage, when he was ordained bishop, as we learn from Optatus[5]. And both Theodoret[6] and Epiphanius[7] say that Athanasius was but a deacon when he was made bishop of Alexandria. Liberatus observes the same[8] of Peter Moggus and Esaias, two other bishops of Alexandria; as also of Agapetus and Vigilius[9], bishops of Rome. Socrates[10] and Theodoret[11] relate the same of Felix, bishop of Rome, who was ordained in the place of Liberius. Eusebius[12] takes notice of one of his own name, a deacon of Alexandria, who was made bishop of Laodicea. And Socrates[13] says Chrysostom made Heraclides, one of his own deacons, bishop of Ephesus, and Serapion, bishop of Heraclea. And that this was a general practice, and agreeable to canon, appears also from a Letter of Pope Leo, where, speaking of the election of a metropolitan,

[5] L. 1. p. 41. (p. 20.) Iterum a Cæciliano mandatum est, ut si Felix in se, sicut illi arbitrabantur, nihil contulisset, ipsi tanquam adhuc diaconum ordinarent Cæcilianum.

[6] See note 3. above.

[7] Hær. 69. Arian. n. 11. (t. 1. p. p. 735 d.) Τότε διαδέχεται Ἀχιλλᾶν τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ποιήσαντα μῆνας τρεῖς Ἀθανάσιος ὁ μακαρίτης, ὧν τότε διάκονος Ἀλεξάνδρου, καὶ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἀπεσταλμένος ἐπὶ τὸ Κομητάτον, ᾧ ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος, μελλων τελευτᾶν, παρήγγειλεν ἀποδοθῆναι τὴν ἐπισκοπίαν.

[8] Breviar. c. 16. (CC. t. 5. p. 765 a.) Post cujus obitum ordinaverunt sibi hæretici episcopum Petrum, cognomento Moggum .... qui fuerat archidiaconus. — Ibid. c. 18. (p. 771 a.) Huic populo a Palæstina quidam diaconus, nomine Esaias, ordinatus est episcopus.

[9] Ibid. c. 21. (p. 774 c.) .... Mortuo Joanne Mercurio, Agapetus archidiaconus Romanæ ecclesiæ papa ordinatur. — Ibid. c. 22. (p. 775 a.) Augusta vero vocans Vigilium, Agapeti diaconum, profiteri sibi secreto ab eo flagitavit, ut si papa fieret, tolleret synodum ..... (Ibid. d.) Favore Belisarii ordinatus est Vigilius.

[10] L. 2. c. 37. (v. 2. p. 143. 40.) Πρῶτος μὲν Λιβέριος, ὁ τῆς Ῥώμης ἐπίσκοπος, παραιτησάμενος ἐκείνῃ τῇ πίστει συνθέσθαι, ἐξόριστος γίνεται, τῶν περὶ Οὐρσάκιον εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτοῦ καταστησάντων Φίληκα· ὃς, διάκονος ὢν τῆς ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἐκκλησίας, καὶ τῇ Ἀρειανῇ δόξῃ προστεθεὶς, εἰς τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν προεβλήθη.

[11] L. 11. c. 17. (v. 3. p. 96. 11.) Ἐκεχειροτόνητο μετὰ τὸν μέγαν Λιβέριον, τῶν διακόνων τὶς τῶν ἐκείνου· Φίληξ ἦν ὄνομα τούτῳ.

[12] L. 7. c. 11. (v. 1. p. 338. 27.) Ἰστέον δὲ ὡς ὁ μὲν Εὐσέβιος, ὃν διάκονον προσεῖπε [Διονύσιος,] σμικρὸν ὕστερον ἐπίσκοπος τῆς κατὰ Συρίαν Λαοδικείας καθίσταται, κ. τ. λ.

[13] L. 6. c. 11. (v. 2. p. 326. 11.) Αὐτὸς τοίνυν Ἡρακλείδην τινὰ, διάκονον ἑαυτοῦ, γένει Κύπριον, εἰς τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν προεβάλλετο.

he says[14], 'he ought to be chosen either out of the presbyters, or out of the deacons of the church.'

Bishc cases neces chose of th rior

6. Sometimes, in cases of necessity, bishops were chosen out of the inferior orders, subdeacons, readers, &c. Liberatus[15] says, Silverius, who was competitor with Vigilius for the bishopric of Rome, was but a subdeacon. And St. Austin himself, when he erected his new bishopric at Fussala, being disappointed of the person whom he intended to have had consecrated bishop, offered one Antonius, a reader, to the primate, to be ordained bishop in his room; and the primate, without any scruple, immediately ordained him; though, as St. Austin[16] testifies, he was but a young man, who had never shewed himself in any other office of the Church beside that of reader.

And some ordin cases daine medi from men.

7. There want not also several instances of persons, who were *ordained bishops immediately of laymen*, when God, by his particular providence, seemed to point them out as the fittest men, in some certain junctures, to be employed in his service. Thus it was in the known case of St. Ambrose, who was but newly baptized, when he was ordained bishop, as both Paulinus[17] and all the historians testify. When the people of

[14] Ep. 84. c. 6. (CC. t. 3. p. 1385 c.) Ex presbyteris ejusdem ecclesiæ, vel ex diaconibus, optimus eligatur.

[15] Breviar. c. 22. (CC. t. 5. p. 775 a.) De cujus decessu audiens Romana civitas Silverium subdiaconum, Hormisdæ quondam papæ filium, elegit ordinandum.

[16] Ep. 261. [al. 209.] ad Cœlestin. (t. 2. p. 777 g.) Obtuli non petentibus quemdam adolescentem, Antonium, qui mecum tunc erat, in monasterio quidem a nobis a parvula ætate nutritum; sed præter lectionis officium nullis clericatus gradibus et laboribus notum. At illi miseri, quod futurum fuerat ignorantes, offerenti eum mihi obedientissime crediderunt. Quid plura? Factum est: esse illis episcopus cœpit.

[17] Vit. Ambros. p. 3. (t. 2. præfix. append. p. 2 c.) Per idem tempus, mortuo Auxentio, Arianæ perfidiæ episcopo...cum populus ad seditionem surgeret in petendo episcopo, essetque illi cura sedandæ seditionis, ne populus civitatis in periculum sui verteretur, perrexit ad ecclesiam: ibique cum alloqueretur plebem, subito vox fertur infantis in populo sonuisse, 'Ambrosium episcopum.' Ad cujus vocis sonum totius populi ora conversa sunt, acclamantis 'Ambrosium episcopum.'.. Cum intelligeret circa se Dei voluntatem, nec se diutius posse resistere, postulavit se non nisi a catholico episcopo baptizari.—Cf. Ruffin. l. 2. [al. 11.] c. 11. (p. 250.) Ambrosius tunc consularis ejusdem provinciæ fasces regebat, &c.—Theodor. l. 4. c. 7. (v. 3. p. 153. 31.) *Οἱ δὲ, τῆς διαμάχης ἐκείνης παυσάμενοι, κοινὴν ἀφῆκαν φωνὴν, Ἀμβρόσιον σφίσιν ἐξαιτοῦντες προβληθῆναι ποιμένα· ἔτι δὲ οὗτος ἀμύητος ἦν.*—Socrat. l. 4. c. 30. (v. 2. p. 253. 4.).... *Μηδὲν ὑπερθέμενοι συλλαμβάνουσι τὸν Ἀμβρόσιον· καὶ βαπτίσαντες, κατηχούμενος γὰρ ἦν, εὐθὺς πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἱερωσύνην προχειρίζεσθαι ἔμελλον.*—Sozom. l. 6. c. 24. (ibid. p. 248. 32.) .... *Ἐξαπίνης πάντες, ἀφέμενοι τῆς πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὀργῆς, ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὸν σύμβουλον τῆς ὁμονοίας ἄγουσι τὴν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ψῆφον· καὶ βαπτίζεσθαι παρ-*

Milan were so divided in the election of a bishop, that the whole city was in an uproar, he, being prætor of the place, came in upon them to appease the tumult, as by virtue of his office he thought himself obliged to do; and making an eloquent speech to them, it had a sort of miraculous effect upon them; for they all immediately left off their dispute, and unanimously cried out, 'They would have Ambrose to be their bishop!' which the emperor understanding, and looking upon it as a providential call, he ordered him to be baptized, (for he was yet but a catechumen,) and in a few days after to be ordained their bishop. St. Cyprian was another instance of the like providential dispensation; for Pontius says, in his Life[18], 'that he was chosen bishop by the judgment of God and the favour of the people, though he was but a neophyte, or newly baptized.' Socrates[19] and Sozomen[20] say the same of Nectarius, Gregory Nazianzen's successor at Constantinople, that he was chosen bishop by the second general Council, 'whilst he had his mystical garments on him,' meaning those white garments, which the newly-baptized were used to wear. Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea in Pontus, St. Basil's predecessor, was not baptized, but only a catechumen, when he was chosen bishop, as Nazianzen himself[21] informs us. And Eucherius was but a monk, that is, a layman, when he was chosen and ordained bishop of Lyons; as Baronius[22] says, from Hilarius Arelatensis,

εκελεύοντο· ἔτι γὰρ ἀμύητος ἦν· καὶ τὴν ἱερωσύνην παραλαμβάνειν ἐδέοντο.

[18] Vit. Cypr. p. 2. (p. 3.) Judicio Dei et plebis favore ad officium sacerdotii et episcopatus gradum adhuc neophytus, et, ut putabatur, novellus, electus est.

[19] L. 5. c. 8. (v. 2. p. 269. 33.) Ἦν δέ τις Νεκτάριος ὄνομα .... ὃς ἁρπασθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ εἰς τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν προεβλήθη, τῶν τότε παρόντων ἑκατὸν πεντήκοντα ἐπισκόπων χειροτονησάντων αὐτόν.

[20] L. 7. c. 8. (ibid. p. 288. 5.) Τὴν μυστικὴν ἐσθῆτα ἔτι ἠμφιέσμενος, κοινῇ ψήφῳ τῆς συνόδου, ἀναγορεύεται Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐπίσκοπος.

[21] Orat. 19. de Laud. Patr. (t. 1. p. 308 d.) Τέλος συμφρονήσας ὁ δῆμος ἅπας, τὸν πρῶτον παρ' αὐτοῖς ἕνα βίῳ μὲν ἐξειλεγμένον, οὔπω δὲ τῷ θείῳ βαπτίσματι κατεσφραγισμένον, τοῦτον ἄκοντα συναρπάσαντες, καὶ ἅμα στρατιωτικῆς χειρὸς συλλαβομένης, αὐτοῖς τηνικαῦτα ἐπιδημούσης, ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμα ἔθεσαν, καὶ τοῖς ἐπισκόποις προσήγαγον, τελεσθῆναί τε ἠξίουν, καὶ κηρυχθῆναι, πειθοῖ βίαν ἀναμίξαντες.

[22] Baron. an. 441. (t. 6. p. 10 b.) .... Ejusdem eremiticam vitam ecclesia præconio celebrat, dum ejus agens natalem diem hæc ait: 'Eucherius, ex nobilissimo senatorum ordine ad religiosam vitam habitumque conversus, diu inter septa speluncæ sponte conclusus, in orationibus et jejuniis Christo servivit;' et quæ sequuntur. At de sancto Eucherio, Lugdunensi episcopo, modo hactenus, &c.

in the Life of Honoratus. Chrysostom[23] seems to say the same of Philogonius, bishop of Antioch, when he reports of him, that he was 'taken from the court of judicature, and carried *from the judge's bench to the bishop's throne!—ἀπὸ βήματος δικαστικοῦ ἐπὶ βῆμα ἱερόν.*' In all these instances there seems to have been the hand of God, and the direction of Providence, which supersedes all ordinary rules and canons; and therefore these ordinations were never censured as uncanonical or irregular, though contrary to the letter of a common rule. Because the rule itself was to be understood with this limitation and exception, as one of the ancient Canons[24] explains itself and all others that relate to this matter; saying, 'one that is newly converted from Gentilism, or a vicious life, ought not presently to be advanced to a bishopric; for it is not fit that he, who has yet given no proof of himself, should be made a teacher of others; *unless it be so ordained by the grace and appointment of God himself,—εἰ μή που κατὰ θείαν χάριν τοῦτο γένοιτο.*' For in this case there could be no dispute, the will of God being superior to all human canons whatsoever. And therefore, though the same limitation be not expressed in other canons, yet it is evident that they are always to be understood with this exception. Upon which account, it was not reckoned any breach of canon to make a layman bishop, when Providence seemed first to grant a dispensation, by directing the Church to be unanimous in the choice of such a person. They did not, in such cases, make a layman receive one order one day, and another the next, and so go through the several orders in the compass of a week, but made him bishop at once, when need required, without any other ordination. The contrary custom is a modern practice, scarce ever heard of till the time of Photius, anno 858, who, to avoid the imputation of not coming

[23] Hom. 31. de S. Philogon. t. 1. p. 397. (t. 1. p. 495 d.) *Ὅτι δὲ ἐκεῖνον ὁ Θεὸς ἐχειροτόνησε, καὶ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ τρόπου, δῆλον· ἐκ μέσης γὰρ τῆς ἀγορᾶς ἁρπασθεὶς ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον ἤγετο τοῦτον· οὕτω σεμνὸν καὶ λαμπρὸν τὸν πρότερον ἐπεδείξατο βίον· καὶ γυναῖκα ἔχων καὶ θυγατέρα, καὶ ἐν δικαστηρίῳ στρεφόμενος· οὕτως ὑπὲρ τὸν ἥλιον ἔλαμψεν, ὡς εὐθέως ἐκεῖθεν ταύτης ἄξιος φανῆναι τῆς ἀρχῆς, καὶ ἀπὸ βήματος δικαστικοῦ ἐπὶ βῆμα ἤγετο ἱερόν.*

[24] C. Apost. 80. (Cotel. [c. 71.] v. 1. p. 447.) *Τὸν ἐξ ἐθνικοῦ βίου* [al. *ἐθνῶν*] *προσελθόντα καὶ βαπτισθέντα, ἢ ἐκ φαύλης διαγωγῆς, οὐ δίκαιόν ἐστι παραυτα* [al. *παραυτίκα*] *προχειρίζεσθαι ἐπίσκοπον* [al. *εἰς ἐπισκοπήν*]· *ἄδικον γὰρ, τὸν μηδὲ πρόπειραν* [al. *μηδέπω πεῖραν*] *ἐπιδειξάμενον ἑτέρων εἶναι διδάσκαλον· εἰ μή που κατὰ θείαν χάριν τοῦτο γίνεται* [al. *γένοιτο.*]

gradually to his bishopric, was on the first day made a monk, on the second a reader, on the third a sub-deacon, on the fourth a deacon, on the fifth a presbyter, and on the sixth a patriarch; as Nicetas David[25], a writer of that age, informs us in the Life of Ignatius. Spalatensis[26] observes the same practice to be continued in the Romish Church, under pretence of complying with the ancient canons; though nothing can be more contrary to the true intent and meaning of them, which was, that men should continue some years in every order, to give some proof of their behaviour to the Church, and not pass cursorily through all orders in five or six days' time: which practice, as it does not answer the end of the canons, so it is altogether without precedent in the primitive Church.

CHAP. XI.

Of some particular laws and customs observed about the ordination of bishops.

Bishoprics not to be void above three months.

1. When any bishopric became void by the death or cession of its bishop, then, forasmuch as bishops were looked upon as a necessary constituent part of the Church, all imaginable care was taken to fill up the vacancy with all convenient speed. In the African Churches a year was the utmost limit that was allowed for a vacancy; for if within that time a new election was not made, he that was appointed administrator of the church during the vacancy, whose business it was to procure and hasten the election, was to be turned out of his office, and a new one put in his room, by a canon of the fifth Council of Carthage[27], which is also confirmed in the African Code[28].

[25] Vit. Ignat. (CC. 8. p. 1200 a.) Ἦν ἀληθῶς ἐκεῖνον ὁρᾶν αὐθήμερον ἅγιον πλαττόμενον κατὰ τὴν παροιμίαν· πρώτῃ γὰρ ἡμέρᾳ μοναχὸς ἀντὶ λαϊκοῦ, τῇ δευτέρᾳ δὲ ἀναγνώστης, καὶ ὑποδιάκονος τῇ ἑξῆς, εἶτα διάκονος, εἶτα πρεσβύτερος· ἔπειτα τῇ ἕκτῃ, Χριστοῦ δὲ ἦν τὰ γενέθλια, καὶ αὐτὸς τῷ ἱερατικῷ προσβὰς θρόνῳ, τὴν εἰρήνην τῷ λαῷ προσεφώνει, μηδὲν τῆς ἀληθινῆς εἰρήνης ἄξιον ἐννοούμενος.

[26] De Republ. part. 1. l. 3. c. 4. [illegible] (p. 430 b. 5.) Non igitur li[illegible] gravissima causa, præ[illegible] ex clero persona apta [illegible] haberi, et laicus insignis suppeteret, laicum in episcopali sede, non sine probatione præcedenti facta ordinatione, collocare. Sic enim in Concilio Sardicensi, c. 13, Osius loquitur: Et hoc, &c. .. Admittitur ergo laicus: sed prius, non ad ludibrium, ut nunc fit, sed vere et non exiguo tempore, inferioribus est ordinibus re ipsa exercendus.

[27] C. 8. (t. 2. p. 1216 e.) Item constitutum est, ut nulli intercessori licitum sit cathedram, cui intercessor datus est, quibuslibet populorum studiis vel seditionibus retinere, sed dare operam, ut intra annum eisdem episcopum provideat.

But in other places this was limited to a much shorter time: for by a canon[29] of the general Council of Chalcedon, every metropolitan is obliged to ordain a new bishop in the vacant see *within the space of three months*, under pain of ecclesiastical censure, unless some unavoidable necessity forced him to defer it longer.

In some places a new bisho was chose before the old one w buried.

2. At Alexandria the custom was to proceed immediately to election *as soon as the bishop was dead, and before he was interred.* Epiphanius[30] hints at this custom when he says, 'they were used to make no delay after the decease of a bishop, but chose one presently, to preserve peace among the people, that they might not run into factions about the choice of a successor.' But Liberatus[31] is a little more particular in describing the circumstances of it. He says, 'it was customary for the successor to watch over the body of the deceased bishop, and to lay his right hand upon his head, and to bury him with his own hands, and then take the pall of St. Mark and put it upon himself, and so sit in his throne.' To these authorities we may add that of Socrates[32], who says, 'that Cyril of Alexandria was enthroned the third day after the death of Theophilus.' And he intimates, that the same thing was practised in other places; for Proclus, bishop of Constantinople[33], was enthroned before Maximian, his predecessor, was interred; and, after his enthronement, he performed the funeral office for him. And this was done at the instance and command of the emperor

Quod si neglexerit, anno exempto, interventor alius tribuatur.

[28] C. 74. (CC. ibid. p. 1094 e.) Ὁμοίως ὡρίσθη, ὥστε μηδενὶ ἐξεῖναι μεσίτῃ τὴν καθέδραν κατέχειν, ᾗ τινι μεσίτης δέδοται, διὰ οἱασδήποτε τῶν λαῶν σπουδὰς ἢ διχοστασίας, ἀλλὰ σπουδάζειν ἐντὸς ἐνιαυτοῦ τοῖς αὐτοῖς προνοεῖσθαι ἐπίσκοπον.

[29] C. 25. (t. 4. p. 767.) Ἔδοξε τῇ ἁγίᾳ συνόδῳ ἐντὸς τριῶν μηνῶν γίνεσθαι τὰς χειροτονίας τῶν ἐπισκόπων, εἰ μή ποτε ἄρα ἀπαραίτητος ἀνάγκη παρασκευάσῃ ἐπιταθῆναι τὸν τῆς ἀναβολῆς χρόνον· εἰ δὲ μὴ τοῦτο ποιήσῃ, ὑποκεῖσθαι αὐτὸν κανονικῷ ἐπιτιμίῳ.

[30] Hær. 69. Arian. n. 11. (t. 1. p. 735.) Ἔθος δὲ ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ μὴ χρονίζειν μετὰ τελευτὴν τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, κ. τ. λ.

[31] Breviar. c. 20. (CC. t. 5. p. 773 d.) Consuetudo quidem est Alexandriæ, illum, qui defuncto succedit, excubias super defuncti corpus agere, manumque dexteram ejus capiti suo imponere; et, sepulto manibus suis, accipere collo suo Beati Marci pallium, et tunc legitime sedere.

[32] L. 7. c. 7. (v. 2. p. 352. 34.).. Τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ μετὰ τὴν τελευτὴν Θεοφίλου ὁ Κύριλλος ἐνθρονισθείς, κ.τ.λ.

[33] Ibid. c. 40. (p. 390. 25.) Ἵνα γὰρ μὴ πάλιν περὶ ἐπιλογῆς ἐπισκόπου ζήτησις, ἢ καὶ ταραχὴν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ κινήσῃ, μὴ μελλήσας, ἀλλ' ἔτι κειμένου τοῦ σώματος Μαξιμιανοῦ, τοῖς παροῦσιν ἐπισκόποις ἐνθρονίσαι τὸν Πρόκλον ἐπίτρεψεν· κ. τ. λ.

Theodosius, that there might be no dispute or tumult raised in the Church about the election of a bishop.

in- s of va- s in of lty rse-

3. Yet, notwithstanding this care and diligence of the Church in filling up vacant sees, it sometimes happened that the election of bishops was *deferred to a much longer season.* For in Afric, at the time of the Collation of Carthage, there were no less than threescore bishoprics void at once, which was above an eighth part of the whole. For the whole number of bishops was but four hundred and sixty-six, whereof two hundred and eighty-six were then present at the conference, and one hundred and twenty were absent by reason of sickness or old age; besides which, there were sixty vacant sees, which were unprovided of bishops at that time, as the Catholics[34] told the Donatists, who pretended to vie [in] numbers with them, though they were but two hundred and seventy-nine. What was the particular reason of so many vacancies at that juncture, is not said; but probably it might be the difficulty of the times, that Catholic bishops could not there be placed, where the Donatists had gotten full possession. Or, perhaps, it might be the negligence of the people, who contented themselves with administrators during the vacancy, and would not admit of a new bishop. The Council of Macriana, mentioned by Fulgentius Ferrandus[35], takes notice of this dilatory practice in some churches, and censures it by a canon, which orders the administrators, who were always some neighbouring bishops, to be removed; and condemns such churches to continue without administrators, till they sought for a bishop of their own. Another reason of long vacancies in some times and places, was the difficult circumstances the churches lay under in time of persecution. For the bishops were the men chiefly aimed at by the persecutors; and therefore, when one bishop was martyred, the Church sometimes was forced to defer the ordination of another, either because it was scarce possible to go about it in

[34] Vid. August. Brevic. Collat. die 1. c. 14. (t. 9. p. 551 c.) Sane propter cathedras, quas episcopis vacuas apud se esse dixerunt, responsum est etiam a catholicis, sexaginta esse, quibus successores episcopi nondum fuerant ordinati.

[35] Breviar. c. 23. (ap. Justel. Corp. Jur. Canon. t. 1. p. 449.) Ut interventores episcopi conveniant plebis quæ episcopum non habent, ut episcopum accipiant: quod si accipere neglexerint, remoto interventore, sic remaneant, quam diu sibi episcopum quærant.

such times of exigency, or because she was unwilling to expose another bishop immediately to the implacable fury of a raging adversary, and bring upon herself a more violent storm of persecution. The Roman[36] clergy give this for their reason to Cyprian, why, after the martyrdom of Fabian, they did not immediately proceed to a new election, 'the state of affairs, and the difficulty of the times, was such as would not permit it.' Baronius[37] reckons the time of this vacancy a year and three months; but others[38], who are more exact in the calculation, make it a year and five months; by either of which accounts, it was above a year beyond the time limited by the canons. But this was nothing in comparison of that long vacancy of the bishopric of Carthage, in the time of the Arian persecution, under Gensericus and Hunericus, two heretical kings of the Vandals, which Victor Uticensis[39] says was no less than twenty-four years, during all which time the Church of Carthage had no bishop. But these were difficulties upon the Church, and matters of force, not her choice; for in times of peace she always acted otherwise, and did not think such extraordinary instances fit precedents to be drawn into example, much less to be drawn into consequence and argued upon, as some[40] have done, that, therefore, the Church may be without bishops, because she subsisted, in some extraordinary vacancies, without them, when she could not have them; which argument would hold as well against any other order as that of bishops, did but they who urge this argument rightly consider it.

4. But to return to the ordination of bishops. At the time appointed for ordination, the metropolitan was used to send forth his circular letters, and summon all the bishops of the province to meet at the place where the new bishop was to be

[36] Ep. 31. [al. 30.] ap. Cypr. p. 58. (p. 211.) Post excessum nobilissimæ memoriæ viri Fabiani, nondum est episcopus propter rerum et temporum difficultates constitutus.

[37] An. 253. n. 6. (t. 2. p. 411 b.) ... Vacasse sedem ejus anno uno et amplius, dicemus anno sequenti in electione Cornelii.—Conf. An. 254. n. 46. (ibid. p. 458 e.) Antequam autem de oborto post Cornelii electionem schismate agamus, &c.

[38] Pearson, Annal. Cypr. an. 250. n. 3. et an. 251. n. 6. (pp. 13. seqq. et pp. 21. seqq.)

[39] De Persecut. Vandal. l. 2. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 8. p. 679 g. 9.) Dedit autem licentiam, Zenone imperatore atque Placidia relicta Olibrii rogantibus, ut Carthaginensis ecclesia sibi quem vellet episcopum ordinasset, quæ jam per 24 annos tali ornamento fuerat destituta.

[40] Blondel, Apol. [pro Sentent. Hieron. de Episc. et Presbyter. Amstel. 1646. 4to.]

ordained, and assist at his consecration. The presence of them all was required, if they could conveniently attend; if not, they were to send their consent in writing, in which case *three bishops*, with the assistance or consent of the metropolitan, were reckoned a sufficient canonical number to perform the ceremony of consecration. St. Cyprian[41] speaks of it as the general practice of the Church in his time, to have all the bishops of the province present at any such ordination. And Eusebius[42] particularly takes notice of the ordination of Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem, who succeeded Narcissus, that he was ordained *μετὰ κοινῆς τῶν ἐπισκόπων γνώμης*, *with the common consent of the bishops of his province.* The Council of Chalcedon[43] calls this *a canonical ordination*, when the metropolitan with all or most of his provincial bishops ordain the bishops of their own province, as the canons have appointed. And the general Council of Constantinople[44] justified the ordinations of Flavian, bishop of Antioch, and Cyril of Jerusalem, as canonical in this respect, because they were ordained by the bishops of their provinces synodically met together. This was the ancient rule of the Council of Nice, which requires the assistance of all the bishops of the province, if they could conveniently[45] attend the ordination. But, forasmuch as that

[41] Ep. 68. [al. 67.] ad Fratr. Hispan. p. 172. (p. 289.) .... Quod apud nos quoque et fere per provincias universas tenetur, ut ad ordinationes rite celebrandas, ad eam plebem, cui præpositus ordinatur, episcopi ejusdem provinciæ proximi quique conveniant, et episcopus deligatur plebe præsente, &c.

[42] L. c. 11. (v. 1. p. 268. 30.) Ἐδήλου γὰρ, προελθόντας ἔξω πυλῶν, τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ προωρισμένον αὐτοῖς ἐπίσκοπον ὑποδέξασθαι· τοῦτο δὲ πράξαντες μετὰ κοινῆς τῶν ἐπισκόπων, οἱ τὰς πέριξ διεῖπον ἐκκλησίας γνώμης, ἐπάναγκες αὐτὸν παραμένειν βιάζονται.

[43] Act. 16. (t. 4. p. 817 c.) Τοὺς μέν τοι κατὰ πόλιν ὁσιωτάτους ἐπισκόπους χειροτονεῖσθαι παρὰ πάντων, ἢ τῶν πλειόνων τῆς ἐπαρχίας εὐλαβεστάτων ἐπισκόπων, τὸ κῦρος ἔχοντος τοῦ μητροπολίτου κατὰ τὸν κείμενον τῶν πατέρων κανόνα.

[44] Ep. Synod. ap. Theodor. l. 5. c. 9. (v. 3. p. 206. 22.) Τῆς δὲ πρεσβυτάτης καὶ ὄντως ἀποστολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τῆς Συρίας, ἐν ᾗ πρώτῃ τὸ τίμιον Χριστιανῶν ἐχρημάτισεν ὄνομα, τὸν αἰδεσιμώτατον καὶ θεοφιλέστατον ἐπίσκοπον Φλαβιανὸν, οἵ τε τῆς ἐπαρχίας καὶ τῆς ἀνατολικῆς διοικήσεως συνδραμόντες κανονικῶς ἐχειροτόνησαν, πάσης συμψήφου τῆς ἐκκλησίας ὥσπερ διὰ μιᾶς φωνῆς τὸν ἄνδρα τιμησάσης· ἥνπερ ἔνθεσμον χειροτονίαν ἐδέξατο καὶ τὸ τῆς συνόδου κοινόν· τῆς δέ γε μητρὸς ἁπασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις τὸν αἰδεσιμώτατον καὶ θεοφιλέστατον Κύριλλον ἐπίσκοπον εἶναι γνωρίζομεν, κανονικῶς [τε] παρὰ τῶν τῆς ἐπαρχίας χειροτονηθέντα.

[45] C. 4. (t. 2. p. 29 e.) Ἐπίσκοπον προσήκει μάλιστα μὲν ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ καθίστασθαι· εἰ δὲ δυσχερὲς εἴη τὸ τοιοῦτο, διὰ μῆκος ὁδοῦ, ἐξ ἅπαντος τρεῖς ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συναγομένους, συμψήφων γινομένων καὶ τῶν ἀπόντων, καὶ συντιθεμένων διὰ γραμμάτων, τότε τὴν χειροτονίαν ποιεῖσθαι.

:r, through urgent necessity, or by reason of their great ınce, it might happen that all of them could not be present, added, 'that in that case three bishops should be sufficient 'dain, provided the metropolitan and the rest sent their con- in writing;' but under three the canons did not generally r of. The first Council of Arles[46], and the third of Car- e[47], require three besides the metropolitan. And the nd Council of Arles[48] does not allow the metropolitan to ne of the three, but saith expressly, 'that he shall take the tance of three provincial bishops beside himself, and not ume to ordain a bishop without them.' It is true those d the Apostolical Canons[49] and Constitutions[50] allow the nation that is performed by two bishops only. But this is rary to all other canons; which are so far from allowing bishops to ordain by themselves, that the Council of ıge[51] orders both the ordaining bishops and the ordained e deposed: and the Council of Riez[52] actually deposed entarius for this very thing, because he had not three ɔps to ordain him. All churches indeed did not punish ordinations with the same severity, but in all places they

C. 20. (t. 1. p. 1429 b.) Si non :rint septem, sine tribus fratri- ıon præsumant ordinare.

C. 39. (t. 2. p. 1172 e.) Forma ua servabitur, ut non minus ı tres sufficiant, qui fuerint a ɔpolitano directi ad ordinandum ɔpum. [Ed. Labb. omits *a me- litano*, and reads *destinati*. Ed.]

d. C. Carth. 6. c. 4. (ibid. 595 b.) Episcopum oportet me quidem ab omnibus, qui intra provinciam episcopis or- i. Si autem hoc difficile fue- .. omnimodo tres in unum con- ntes, &c.

C. 5. Nec episcopus metropoli- ı sine tribus episcopis compro- alibus præsumat episcopum or- e. [Labbe (t. 4. p. 1011 e.) ı it thus,—Episcopum sine me- ɔlitano vel epistola metropoli- vel tribus comprovincialibus, iceat ordinare, &c. Ed.]

C. 1. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 437.) 'Επί- ος χειροτονείσθω ὑπὸ ἐπισκόπων τριῶν.

[50] L. 8. c. 27. (Cotel. ibid. p. 410.) .... 'Επίσκοπος ὑπὸ τριῶν ἢ δύο ἐπισκόπων χειροτονείσθω. ἐὰν δέ τις ὑπὸ ἑνὸς χειροτονηθῇ ἐπισκόπου, καθαιρείσθω, κ. τ. λ.

[51] Arausic. 1. c. 21. (t. 3. p. 1450.) In nostris provinciis placuit de presumtionibus, ut sicubi contigerit duos episcopos episcopum invitum facere, auctoribus damnatis, unius eorum ecclesiæ ipse, qui vim passus est, substituatur, si tamen vita respondet; et alter in alterius dejecti loco nihilo minus ordinetur. Si voluntarium duo fecerint, et ipse damnabitur, quo cautius ea quæ sunt antiquitus statuta serventur.

[52] C. 1. (ibid. p. 1286 a.) Ordinationem, quam canones irritam definiunt, nos quoque evacuandam esse censuimus; in qua, prætermissa trium præsentia, nec expetitis comprovincialium literis, metropolitani quoque voluntate neglecta, prorsus nihil quod episcopum faceret ostensum est.

were reckoned uncanonical. When Paulinus ordained Evagrius bishop of Antioch, Theodoret[53] takes notice 'that this was done against the laws of the Church,' because he was ordained by a single person, and without the consent of the provincial bishops. And Synesius[54] says the same of the ordination of Siderius, bishop of Palæbisca, 'that it was irregular, because he neither had the consent of the bishop of Alexandria, his metropolitan, nor three bishops to ordain him.' It was to avoid this censure of irregularity, that Novatian, when he set himself up to be bishop of Rome against Cornelius[55], sent for three bishops out of the furthest corner of Italy to come and ordain him, lest it should be objected against him that he had not a canonical ordination. And upon this account, when Pelagius the First was to be ordained bishop of Rome, because three bishops could not be procured, a presbyter[56] was taken in to make up the number; in all which the general practice of the Church is very clearly seen and described.

di- 5. Yet it must be observed, though this was the common
by rule and practice of the Church, yet it was not simply and
hop absolutely of the essence of ordination; for the Church many
l to times admitted of the ordinations of bishops that were conse-
d, not crated only by one or two bishops. The Council of Orange[57],
al. which orders both the ordaining bishops and the ordained to

[53] L. 5. c. 23. (v. 3. p. 224. 33.) Τοῦτο καὶ Ῥωμαίοις καὶ Αἰγυπτίοις δυσμένειαν πρὸς τὴν ἑῴαν μακροτάτην εἰργάσατο· οὐδὲ γὰρ τῷ Παυλίνου θανάτῳ συγκατελύθη τὸ ἔχθος. Ἀλλὰ καὶ μετ' ἐκεῖνον Εὐαγρίου τὸν ἐκείνου παρειληφότος θρόνον, διέμειναν τῷ μεγάλῳ Φλαβιανῷ χαλεπαίνοντες, καὶ ταῦτα τοῦ Εὐαγρίου παρὰ τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν προβεβλημένου θεσμόν· μόνος γὰρ αὐτὸν ὁ Παυλῖνος προὐβάλετο, πολλοὺς κανόνας κατὰ ταυτὸν παραβάς· οὔτε γὰρ ἀνθ' ἑαυτοῦ τῷ τελευτῶντι χειροτονεῖν ἐπιτρέπουσι, καὶ πάντας συγκαλεῖσθαι τῆς ἐπαρχίας τοὺς ἐπισκόπους κελεύουσι· καὶ αὖ πάλιν δίχα τριῶν ἐπισκόπων ἐπισκόπῳ χειροτονίαν ἀπαγορεύουσι γίνεσθαι.

[54] Ep. 67. (p. 210 a. 1.) Τοῦτον οὖν ἕνα καὶ μόνον ἀποδεδεῖχθαι Παλαιβίσκης ἐπίσκοπον· ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τοῦτον ἐνθέσμως· ἐκθέσμως μὲν οὖν, ὅσα γε τῶν γερόντων ἠκούσαμεν· εἰ μήτε ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ κατέστη, μήτε παρὰ τριῶν ἐνθάδε, καὶ εἰ τὸ σύνθημα τῆς χειροτονίας ἐκεῖθεν ἐδέδοτο· μόνον γάρ φασι δὴ τὸν μακάριον Φίλωνα θαρσῆσαι τὴν τοῦ συνιερέως ἀνάρρησιν.

[55] Ap. Euseb. l. 6. c. 43. ex Ep. Cornel. See ch. 3. s. 5. p. 78. n. 8.

[56] Lib. Pontific. Vit. Pelag. (CC. t. 5. p. 787 c.) Dum non essent episcopi, qui eum ordinarent, inventi sunt duo episcopi, Joannes de Perusio et Bonus de Ferentino, et Andreas presbyter de Ostia, et ordinaverunt eum. [Anastasius Bibliothecarius, de Vit. Pontif., Romæ, 1718. s. 109. (t. 1. p. 111.) reads,—Dum non esset episcopus qui eum ordinaret, &c. Ed.]

[57] Arausic. 1. c. 21. See s. 4. n. 51. preceding.

be deposed, in case two bishops only ordained a bishop with his consent, decrees notwithstanding, 'that if a bishop was ordained by any sort of violence against his will, though only by two bishops, in that case his ordination should stand good, because he was passive in the thing, and not consenting to the breach of the canons.' And without this passivity there are several instances of ordinations by two bishops only, the validity of which we do not find disputed. Pelagius, bishop of Rome, was reckoned a true bishop, though, as we have just now heard, he had but two bishops and a presbyter to ordain him. Dioscorus of Alexandria was consecrated likewise by two bishops only, and those under ecclesiastical censure, as we learn from an Epistle of the bishops of Pontus[58] at the end of the Council of Chalcedon. Yet neither that Council nor any others ever questioned the validity of his ordination, unless perhaps those Pontic bishops did, who call it *nefandam atque imaginariam ordinationem.* Siderius, bishop of Palæbisca, was ordained by one bishop, yet Athanasius not only allowed his ordination and confirmed it, but finding him to be a useful man, he afterwards advanced him, as Synesius[59] says, to the metropolitical see of Ptolemais. Paulinus, bishop of Antioch, ordained Evagrius his successor without any other bishop to assist him; which, though it was done against canon, yet Theodoret[60] assures us, 'that both the bishops of Rome and Alexandria owned Evagrius for a true bishop, and never in the least questioned the validity of his ordination.' And though they afterwards consented to acknowledge Flavian, at the instance of Theodosius, to put an end to the schism, yet they did it upon this condition, that the ordinations of such as had been ordained by Evagrius should be reputed valid also; as we learn

[58] Ep. Episcop. Pont. ad calc. C. Chalced. (CC. t. 4. p. 960 c.) Ordinationem suam a damnatis episcopis, et hoc duobus, accepit, cum regulæ patrum .... vel tres episcopos corporaliter adesse in hujusmodi dispensationibus omnino prospiciant.

[59] Ep. 67. (p. 210 b. 3.) Τοῦτον ἥκοντα μόνον ἀποδεῖξαί σε, καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου καθίσαι τὸν μακαρίτην Σιδήριον· ἀνάγκη γὰρ ἐν καιροῖς ἀπαρρησιάστοις τὴν ἀκρίβειαν παραβαίνεσθαι· διὰ τοῦτο τὸν πάμμεγαν Ἀθανάσιον συγχωρῆσαί τε τῷ καιρῷ· καὶ μετ' οὐ πολὺ, δεῆσαν ἐν Πτολεμαΐδι τὸν ἐνόντα σμικρὸν ἔτι τῆς ὀρθοδοξίας σπινθῆρα θάλψαι τε καὶ ἐπὶ πλέον ἐξάψαι, τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον, ὡς μείζοσι πράγμασιν ἐπιτήδειον, ἐκεῖ διαθῆναι κελεῦσαι, τὴν μετροπολῖτιν ἐκκλησίαν ἐπιτροπεύσαντα.

[60] Lib. 5. c. 23. See n. 53. preceding.

from the Letters of Pope Innocent[61], who lived not long after this matter was transacted.

The bishop of Rome not privileged to ordain alone, any more than any other single bishop.

6. Hence it appears, that the ordination of a bishop made by any single bishop was valid, if the Church thought fit to allow it; *nor had the bishop of Rome any peculiar privilege in this matter* above other men, though some pretend to make a distinction. There is indeed an ancient canon, alleged in the Collection of Fulgentius Ferrandus out of the Council of Zella and the Letters of Siricius, which seems to make a reserve in behalf of the bishop of Rome; for it says[62], 'one bishop shall not ordain a bishop, the Roman Church excepted.' But Cotelerius[63] ingenuously owns this to be a corruption in the text of Ferrandus, foisted in by the ignorance or fraud of some modern transcriber, who confounded two decrees of Siricius into one, and changed the words *sedes apostolica primatis*, into *sedes apostolica Romana*. For in the words of Siricius[64] there is no mention made at all of the Roman Church, but it is said, 'that no one shall ordain without the consent of the apostolical see, that is, the primate' or metropolitan of the province; and 'that one bishop alone shall not ordain a bishop, because that is arrogant and assuming, and looks like giving an ordination by stealth, and is expressly forbidden by the Nicene Council.' So that in these times the bishops of Rome were under the direction of the canons, and did not presume to think they had any privilege of ordaining singly, above what was common to the rest of their order.

[61] Ep. 14. ad Bonifac. (CC. t. 2. p. 1265 e.) Ecclesia Antiochena.... ita pacem postulavit et meruit, ut et Evagrianos suis ordinibus ac locis, intemerata ordinatione, quam acceperant a memorato, susciperet.

[62] Breviar. c. 6. (ap. Justel. Corp. Jur. Canon. t. 1. p. 488.) Ut unus episcopus episcopum non ordinet, excepta ecclesia Romana. Concilio Zellensi. Ex Epistola Papæ Siricii.

[63] Not. in Constit. Apost. l. 3. c. 20. (v. 1. p. 290.) Hoc loco celatum nolim lectorem errorem geminum, qui apparet in Breviatione Canonum Fulgentii Ferrandi, c. 6: *Ut unus episcopus, etc.* Etenim duo prima decreta Epistolæ quartæ Siricii perperam commiscentur; et sedes apostolica primatis, seu metropolitana, mutatur in sedem apostolicam Romanam; non culpa, suspicor, Ferrandi, sed ignorantia vel fraude cujusdam recentioris, &c.

[64] Ep. 4. c. 1. (CC. t. 2. p. 1029 c.) Ut extra conscientiam sedis apostolicæ, hoc est, primatis, nemo audeat ordinare.—C. 2. (ibid. d.) Ne unus episcopus episcopum ordinare præsumat propter arrogantiam, ne furtivum beneficium præstitutum videatur. Hoc enim et a [al. in] Synodo Nicæna constitutum est atque definitum. [al. constat esse definitum.]

7. The next thing to be taken notice of in this affair is that every bishop by the laws and custom of the Church was to be *ordained in his own church*, in the presence of his own people. Which is plainly intimated by Cyprian[65] when he says, 'that to celebrate ordinations aright, the neighbouring bishops of the province were used to meet at the church where the new bishop was to be ordained, and there proceed to his election and ordination.' And this was so generally the practice of the whole Church, that Pope Julius[66] made it an objection against Gregory of Alexandria, who was obtruded on the Church by the Eusebian party in the room of Athanasius, 'that he was ordained at Antioch, and not in his own church, but sent thither with a band of soldiers;' whereas by the ecclesiastical canon, he ought to have been 'ordained ἐπ' αὐτῆς τῆς ἐκκλησίας, *in the church of Alexandria itself*, and that by the bishops of his own province.' This rule was very nicely observed in the African Churches, where it was the constant custom for the primate, whose office it was to ordain bishops, to go to the church, where the new bishop was to be settled, and ordain him there. Of this we have several instances in St. Austin, who himself was ordained in his own church at Hippo[67] by the primate of Numidia; and having divided his diocese, and erected a new bishopric at Fussala, and elected a bishop, he sent for the primate[68], though living at a great distance, to come to the place and ordain him there.

Every bishop to be ordained in his own church.

8. As to *the manner and form of ordaining a bishop*, it is thus briefly described by one of the Councils[69] of Carthage:

The ancient form of ordination of bishops.

[65] Ep. 68. [al. 67.] ad Fratr. Hispan. p. 172. See before, s. 4. p. 136. n. 41.

[66] Ep. ad. Oriental. ap. Athanas. Apol. 2. t. 1. p. 749. See before, ch. 10. s. 2. p. 124. n. 90.

[67] Possid. Vit. August. c. 8. (t. 10. append. p. 262 d.) Unde amplius formidans idem venerabilis senex, et sciens se corpore et ætate infirmissimum, egit secretis literis apud primatem episcoporum Carthaginiensem, allegans imbecillitatem corporis sui, ætatisque gravitatem, et obsecrans, ut Hipponensi ecclesiæ ordinaretur episcopus, quo suæ cathedræ non tam succederet, sed consacerdos accederet Augustinus.

[68] Vid. August. Ep. 261. [al. 209.] (t. 2. p. 777 f.) Propter quem ordinandum, sanctum senem, qui tunc primatum Numidiæ gerebat, de longinquo ut veniret rogans, literis impetravi.

[69] Carth. 4. c. 2. (t. 2. p. 1199 d.) Episcopus cum ordinatur, duo episcopi ponant et teneant evangeliorum codicem super caput et verticem ejus, et, uno super eum fundente benedictionem, reliqui omnes episcopi, qui adsunt, manibus suis caput ejus tangant.

'When a bishop is ordained, two bishops shall hold the book of the Gospels over his head; and, whilst one pronounces the blessing or consecration-prayer, all the rest of the bishops that are present shall lay their hands upon his head.' The ceremony of laying the Gospels upon his head seems to have been in use in all Churches. For the author of the Apostolical Constitutions[70], a Greek writer, who is supposed to relate the customs of the third century, makes mention of it, only with this difference, that instead of two bishops, there two deacons are appointed to hold the Gospels open over his head, whilst the senior bishop or primate, with two other bishops assisting him, pronounces the prayer of consecration. This ceremony of holding the Gospels over his head is also mentioned by St. Chrysostom[71] and the author of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy under the name of Dionysius[72], who says it was a peculiar ceremony used only in the ordination of a bishop.

of used con-
on.

9. The author of the Constitutions recites one of *the ancient forms of prayer*, the close of which is[73] in these words: 'Grant to him, O Lord Almighty, by thy Christ, the communication of the Holy Spirit, that he may have power to remit sins according to thy commandment, and to confer orders according to thy appointment, and to loose every bond according to the

[70] L. 8. c. 4. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 391.) Καὶ σιωπῆς γενομένης, εἷς τῶν πρώτων ἐπισκόπων ἅμα καὶ δυσὶν ἑτέροις πλησίον τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου ἐστὼς, τῶν λοιπῶν ἐπισκόπων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων σιωπῇ προσευχομένων, τῶν δὲ διακόνων τὰ θεῖα εὐαγγέλια ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ χειροτονουμένου κεφαλῆς ἀνεπτυγμένα κατεχόντων, λεγέτω πρὸς Θεόν, κ.τ.λ.

[71] De Laud. Evang. cited by Habertus, Archierat. (p. 79.) Ἐν ταῖς χειροτονίαις τῶν ἱερέων, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐπὶ κεφαλῆς τίθεται, ἵνα μάθῃ ὁ χειροτονούμενος, ὅτι τὴν ἀληθινὴν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τιάραν λαμβάνει· καὶ ἵνα μάθῃ, εἰ καὶ πάντων ἐστὶ κεφαλὴ, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τούτους πράττει τοὺς νόμους, πάντων κρατῶν καὶ τῷ νόμῳ κρατούμενος, πάντα νομοθετῶν καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου νομοθετούμενος. Διὰ τοῦτο.... Ἰγνάτιος.... ἐπιστέλλων τινὶ ἱερεῖ ἔλεγε, Μηδὲν ἄνευ γνώμης σου γινέσθω, μηδὲ σὺ ἄνευ γνώμης Θεοῦ τι πράττε. Τὸ τοίνυν ἔχειν τὸν ἀρχιερέα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον σημεῖόν ἐστι τὸ ὑπ' ἐξουσίαν εἶναι.

[72] Eccles. Hierarch. c. 5. part. 3. s. 7. (t. 1. p. 239 b. seqq.) Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν, ὡς ἔφην, κ. τ. λ.

[73] L. 8. c. 5. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 392.) Δὸς αὐτῷ, Δέσποτα παντοκράτορ, διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, τὴν μετουσίαν τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, ὥστε ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας κατὰ τὴν ἐντολήν σου· διδόναι κλήρους κατὰ τὸ πρόσταγμά σου· λύειν δὲ πάντα σύνδεσμον κατὰ τὴν ἐξουσίαν, ἣν ἔδωκας τοῖς ἀποστόλοις· εὐαρεστεῖν δέ σοι ἐν πραότητι καὶ καθαρᾷ καρδίᾳ, ἀτρέπτως, ἀμέμπτως, ἀνεγκλήτως· προσφέροντά σοι καθαρὰν καὶ ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν· ἣν διὰ Χριστοῦ διετάξω τὸ μυστήριον τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης, εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου παιδός σου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, δι' οὗ σοι δόξα, τιμὴ, καὶ σέβας, ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ, καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων· ἀμήν.

power which Thou gavest to the Apostles; that he may please Thee in meekness and a pure heart, constantly, blamelessly, and without rebuke; and may offer unto Thee that pure unbloody sacrifice, which Thou by Christ hast appointed to be the mystery or sacrament of the new covenant, for a sweet-smelling savour; through Jesus Christ thy Holy Son, our God and Saviour, by whom be glory, honour and worship to Thee, in the Holy Spirit, now and for ever. Amen.' It is not to be imagined that one and the same form was used in all churches; for every bishop having liberty to frame his own liturgy, as there were different liturgies in different churches, so it is most reasonable to suppose the primates or metropolitans had different forms of consecration, though there are now no remains of them in being, to give us any further information.

Of their enthronement, *homiliæ enthronisticæ* and *literæ enthronisticæ*.

10. The consecration being ended, the bishops that were present conducted the new-ordained bishop to *his chair* or *throne*, and there placing him, they all saluted him with an holy kiss in the Lord. Then the Scriptures being read, according to custom, as part of the daily service, the new bishop made a discourse or exposition upon them, which was usually called *sermo enthronisticus*, from the time and circumstances in which it was spoken. Such was that famous Homily of Meletius, bishop of Antioch, mentioned by Epiphanius[74] and Sozomen[75], for which he was immediately sent into banishment by Constantius. Socrates[76] frequently takes notice of such homilies made by bishops at their instalment; and Liberatus[77] speaking of Severus of Antioch, mentions his exposition made upon that occasion, calling it *expositio in inthronismo*. It

[74] Hær. 73. Semiarian. nn. 29—33. (t. 1. pp. 876—882.)

[75] L. 4. c. 28. (v. 2. pp. 174, 175.)

[76] L. 2. c. 43. (ibid. p. 160. 5.) Εὐδόξιος δὲ καθεσθεὶς εἰς τὸν θρόνον αὐτῆς, πρώτην ἐκείνην τὴν πολυθρύλλητον ἀφῆκε φωνὴν, φράσας· Ὁ Πατὴρ ἀσεβής· ὁ Υἱὸς εὐσεβὴς, κ. τ. λ. —Ibid. L. 7. c. 29. (p. 878. 1.).... Γριμήνου οὖν διαδραμόντος, ἄγεται ἐκ τῆς Ἀντιοχείας ὁ Νεστόριος, ὅστις ἐπὶ σωφροσύνῃ μὲν παρὰ τοῖς πλείστοις ἐκηρύττετο· ὁποῖος δὲ ἦν ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις τὸ ἦθος, ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης αὐτοῦ διδασκαλίας τοὺς εὖ φρονοῦντας οὐκ ἔλαθε. Χειροτονηθεὶς γὰρ τῇ δεκάτῃ τοῦ Ἀπριλλίου μηνὸς, ἐν ὑπατείᾳ Φίληκος καὶ Ταύρου, εὐθὺς ἐκείνην τὴν περιβόητον ἀφῆκε φωνὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ λαοῦ παντὸς, πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα τὸν λόγον ποιούμενος· Δός μοι, φησὶν, ὦ βασιλεῦ, καθαρὰν τὴν γῆν τῶν αἱρετικῶν, κἀγώ σοι τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀντιδώσω· συγκάθελέ μοι τοὺς αἱρετικοὺς, κἀγὼ συγκαθελῶ σοι τοὺς Πέρσας.

[77] Breviar. c. 19. (CC. t. 5. p. 772 c.) Fertur expositio ejus, quæ ab eo dicta est in inthronismo, in qua et unitivum suscepit Zenonis, &c.

was usual also for bishops, immediately after their instalment, to send letters to foreign bishops to give them an account of their faith and orthodoxy, that they might receive letters of peace and communion again from them. Which letters were therefore called *literæ enthronisticæ*, or *συλλαβαὶ ἐνθρονιστικαὶ*, as Evagrius[78] terms them, speaking of the circular letters which Severus, bishop of Antioch, wrote to the rest of the patriarchs upon that occasion. These were otherwise called *κοινωνικὰ συγγράμματα*, *communicatory letters*, as the Council of Antioch, that deposed Paulus Samosatensis, terms them. For the fathers in that Council, having ordained Domnus in the room of Paul, gave notice thereof to all churches, telling them, 'that they signified it to them for this reason, that they might write to Domnus and receive *κοινωνικὰ συγγράμματα*[79], *communicatory letters*, from him.' Which, as Valesius[80] rightly notes, do not mean there those letters of communion, which bishops were used to grant to persons travelling into foreign countries, but such letters as they wrote to each other upon their own ordination, to testify their communion mutually with one another. These letters are also called *synodicæ* by Liberatus[81], who says, 'this custom of every new bishop's giving intimation of his own promotion to those of his own order was so necessary, that the omission of it was interpreted a sort of refusal to hold communion with the rest of the world, and a virtual charge of heresy upon them.'

[78] L. 4. c. 4. (v. 3. p. 386. 12.)... Μάλιστά γε ἐν ταῖς καλουμέναις ἐνθρονιστικαῖς συλλαβαῖς, καὶ ταῖς τούτων ἀμοιβαίαις, ἃς διεπέμψατο τοῖς ἑκασταχοῦ πατριάρχαις κ. τ. λ.

[79] Vid. Euseb. l. 7. c. 30. (v. 1. p. 363. 28.) Ἐδηλώσαμέν τε ὑμῖν, ὅπως τούτῳ γράφητε, καὶ τὰ παρὰ τούτου κοινωνικὰ δέχησθε γράμματα.

[80] Not. in loc. citat. (ibid. n. 5.) Aliæ [communicatoriæ literæ] clericis et laicis peregrinaturis dabantur .... Aliæ erant quas episcopi testandæ communiones suæ causa ad alios mittebant episcopos, et quas ipsi vicissim ab aliis accipiebant: de quibus hic loquitur Synodus. Eæ autem paulo post ordinationem mitti solebant a recens ordinatis episcopis.

[81] Breviar. c. 17. (CC. t. 5. p. 766 a.) De quo etiam Acacius synodicam Romano papæ misit epistolam, petens, &c..... Verum Joannes Talaia de ordinatione sua neglexit per suas synodicas literas Acacio episcopo Constantinopolitano destinare.... Quia literas synodicas non direxisset, &c.

CHAPTER XII.

Of the rule which prohibits bishops to be ordained in small cities.

1. Before I end this discourse about bishops, I must give an account of two rules more respecting their ordination. The first of which was, that bishops should not be placed in small cities or villages; which law was first made by the Council of Sardica, with a design to keep up the honour and dignity of the episcopal order, as the reason is given in the canon made about it, which says[82], 'It shall not be lawful to place a bishop in a village or small city, where a single presbyter will be sufficient; for in such places there is no need to set a bishop, lest the name and authority of bishops be brought into contempt.' Some add to this the fifty-seventh canon of the Council of Laodicea[83], which forbids the placing of bishops in villages and in the country, appointing visitors to be constituted in their room: but this canon speaks not of absolute bishops, but of the *chorepiscopi*, who were subject to other bishops, of which I shall treat particularly hereafter. However, there is no dispute about the Sardican canon; for the reason annexed explains its meaning, that it prohibits universally the ordination of bishops in small cities and country places.

The reason of the law against placing bishops in small cities.

2. But it may be observed that this rule did never generally obtain; for both before and after the Council of Sardica there were bishops both in small cities and villages. Nazianzum was but a very small city: Socrates[84] calls it πόλις εὐτελής, *a little one;* and upon the same account Gregory Nazianzen[85] styles his own father, who was bishop of it, μικροπολίτης, *a little bishop* and one of the second order. Yet he was no *chorepiscopus*, but as absolute a bishop in his own diocese as the bishop of

Some exceptions to this rule in Egypt, Libya, Cyprus, Arabia, Asia Minor, &c.

[82] C. 6. (t. 2. p. 632 c.) Μὴ ἐξεῖναι δὲ ἁπλῶς καθιστᾶν ἐπίσκοπον ἐν κώμῃ τινὶ ἢ βραχείᾳ πόλει, ᾗ τινι καὶ εἰς μόνος πρεσβύτερος ἐπαρκεῖ· οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον γὰρ ἐπισκόπους ἐκεῖσε καθίστασθαι, ἵνα μὴ κατευτελίζηται τὸ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου ὄνομα καὶ ἡ αὐθεντία.

[83] C. 57. (t. 1. p. 1505 e.) Οτι οὐ δεῖ ἐν ταῖς κώμαις καὶ ἐν ταῖς χώραις καθίστασθαι ἐπισκόπους, ἀλλὰ περιοδευτάς.

[84] L. 4. c. 11. (v. 2. p. 223. 11.) .... Βασίλειος καὶ Γρηγόριος· ὧν ὁ μὲν Καισαρείας τῆς ἐν Καππαδοκίᾳ ἐπίσκοπος ἦν· Γρηγόριος δὲ Ναζιανζοῦ, πόλεως εὐτελοῦς, γειτνιαζούσης τῇ Καισαρείᾳ.—Ibid. c. 26. (p. 247. 3.) Γρηγόριος δὲ τῆς Ναζιανζοῦ, πόλεως εὐτελοῦς, κ. τ. λ.

[85] Orat. 19. de Laud. Patr. (t. 1. p. 310 b.).... Τοῦτο τοῦ μικροπολίτου τὸ ἔργον καὶ τῆς καθέδρας τὰ δεύτερα ἔχοντος.

Rome or Alexandria. Geræ, near Pelusium, was but a small city, as Sozomen[86] notes, yet it was a bishop's see. Theodoret[87] observes the same of Dolicha, where Maris was bishop, that it was but a very little city: he calls it πολίχνη σμικρά. And he says the like of Cucusus[88] in Armenia, the place whither Chrysostom was banished: yet, as small a city as it was, Chrysostom[89] found a bishop there, who treated him very civilly and respectfully in his exile. Synesius makes mention of the bishop of Olbiæ in one of his Epistles[90], and at the same time tells us the place was but a village: for he calls the people δῆμος κωμήτης, *a country people*. So he says in another Epistle[91], that Hydrax and Palæbisca had for some time each of them their own bishop, though they were but villages of Pentapolis, formerly belonging to the diocese of Erythra, to which they were some time after annexed again. In Sozomen's time, among the Arabians and Cyprians, it was an usual thing to ordain bishops not only in cities, but villages: as also among the Novatians and Montanists in Phrygia: all which he affirms[92] upon his own knowledge. Some think Dracontius was such a bishop, because Athanasius[93] styles his

[86] L. 8. c. 19. (ibid. p. 350. 28.) Ἀπὸ τοῦ πελάγους ὧδε σιμβάν, κατῆρεν εἰς Γέρας, πόλιν μικράν, ἀμφὶ πεντήκοντα στάδια τοῦ Πηλουσίου ἀφεστῶσαν· τελευτήσαντος δὲ τότε τοῦ ἐνθάδε ἐπισκόπου, οἱ μὲν πολῖται, ὡς ἐπιθύμην, ἐψηφίσαντο Νιλάμμωνα προστατεῖν τῆς αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίας, κ. τ. λ.

[87] L. 5. c. 4. (v. 3. p. 198. 13.) Ὁ δὲ θεῖος Εὐσέβιος ἔσχατον ἐπίσκοπον Μάριν τῇ Δολιχῇ κεχειροτόνηκε· πολίχνη δὲ αὕτη σμικρά, καὶ τῆς Ἀρειανικῆς νόσου κατ' ἐκεῖνο τοῦ καιροῦ μετειλήφει.

[88] L. 2. c. 5. (ibid. p. 72. 16.) ... Μετῴκισαν δὲ εἰς Κουκουσόν· πόλις δὲ αὕτη μικρά.—L. 5. c. 34. (ibid. p. 234. 11.) ... Εἴς τινα πολίχνην σμικράν τε καὶ ἔρημον τῆς Ἀρμενίας ἐξέπεμψαν· Κουκουσὸς δὲ ὄνομα ταύτῃ.

[89] Ep. 125. [Savil. 143.] ad Cyriac. (t. 3. p. 670 e. & p. 671 b.) Ταῦτά σοι ἀπέστειλα ἀπὸ Κουκουσοῦ τῆς Κιλικίας, ὅπου ἐκέλευσεν ἡμᾶς ἡ βασίλισσα ἐξορισθῆναι ..... Πάνυ δὲ ἡμᾶς ἐδεξιώσατο ὁ ἐπίσκοπος τῆς πόλεως ταύτης, κ. τ. λ.

[90] Ep. 76. (p. 222 c. S.) Ὀλβίαις· οὗτοι δὲ δῆμός εἰσι κωμήτης.) ἐδέησεν αἱρέσεως ἐπισκόποι, τοῦ μακαριωτάτου πατρὸς Ἀθάμαντος τῷ μακρῷ τὴν ἱερωσύνην συγκαταλύσαντος.

[91] Ep. 67. p. 208 b. 1. ..... Γέγονα κατὰ Παλαιβίσκαν τε καὶ Ὕδρακα· κῶμαι δὲ αὗται Πενταπόλεως.—Ibid. (p. 210 a. 1.) .... Τοῦτον οὖν ἕνα καὶ μόνον ἀποδεδείχθαι Παλαιβίσκης ἐπίσκοπον.—Ibid. (p. 211 c. 1. Ἐν Ὕδρακι τῇ κώμῃ χώμιόν ἐστι .... τοῦτο τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἡμῶν ἤδη καὶ ἄλλοις τοῖς εὐλαβεστάτοις ἐπισκόποις, Διοσκώρῳ καὶ Παύλῳ, τὸ περιμάχητον ἦν, κ. τ. λ.

[92] L. 7. c. 19. (v. 2. p. 307. 7.) Ἔστιν ὅπη καὶ ἐν κώμαις ἐπίσκοποι ἱεροῦνται, ὡς παρὰ Ἀρυβίοις καὶ Κυπρίοις ἔγνων, κ. τ. λ.

[93] Ep. ad Dracont. t. 1. p. 954. (t. 1. part 1. p. 207 d. n. 1.) Καὶ γὰρ ἡ ἐκ παραδόξου γενομένη συμφωνία ἐν τῇ Ἀλεξανδρέων χώρᾳ, ἐν τῇ σῇ κα-

bishopric χώρας ἐπισκοπήν. But whether this means that he was an absolute bishop, or only a *chorepiscopus*, as others think, is not very easy to determine. As neither what kind of bishops those were which the Council of Antioch[94], in their Synodical Epistle against Paulus Samosatensis, calls *country bishops;* for perhaps they might be only *chorepiscopi* or dependant bishops, as Valesius conjectures. But this cannot be said of those mentioned by Sozomen, nor of the other instances I have given out of Synesius and the rest of the forecited authors; from whose testimonies it plainly appears, that there were bishops in very small cities, and sometimes in villages, notwithstanding the contrary decree of the Sardican Council. It is also very observable, that in Asia Minor, a tract of land not much larger than the isle of Great Britain, (including but two dioceses of the Roman empire,) there were almost four hundred bishops, as appears from the ancient Notitia of the Church. Whence it may be collected, that Cucusus and Nazianzen were not the only small cities in those parts, but that there were many other cities and dioceses of no very great extent in such a number.

Rea erec bish in s citie

3. One thing that contributed much to the multiplication of bishoprics, and that caused them to be erected sometimes in small places, was, that in the primitive Church every bishop, with the consent of his metropolitan or the approbation of a provincial council, had power *to divide his own diocese*, and ordain a new bishop in some convenient part of it, for the good of the Church; whenever he found his diocese too large, or the places to lie at too great a distance, or the multitude of converts to increase, and make the care and incumbrance of his diocese become too great a burden for him. This was the reason why St. Austin[95] erected a new bishopric at Fussala, a town in his own diocese, about forty miles from Hippo. It was

ταστάσει, ἐξ ἀνάγκης σχισθήσεται διὰ τὴν σὴν ἀναχώρησιν· καὶ ἡ ἐπισκοπὴ δὲ τῆς χώρας αὐτῆς ὑπὸ πολλῶν ἁρπαγήσεται, καὶ πολλῶν οὐκ ὀρθῶν, ἀλλ' ὧν οἶδας καὶ αὐτός.

[94] Ap. Euseb. l. 7. c. 30. (v. 1. p. 362. б.) .... Ἐπισκόπους τῶν ὁμόρων ἀγρῶν τε καὶ πόλεων.

[95] Ep. 261. [al. 209.] ad Cælestin. (t. 2. p. 777 d.e.) Sed quod ab Hippone memoratum castellum [Fussala] millibus quadraginta sejungitur, cum in eis regendis, et eorum reliquiis, licet exiguis, colligendis .... me viderem latius quam oportebat extendi, nec adhibendæ sufficere diligentiæ, quam certissima ratione adhiberi debere cernebam, episcopum ibi ordinandum constituendumque curavi.

a place where great numbers had been converted from the schism of the Donatists, and some remained to be converted still: but the place lying at so great a distance, he could not bestow that care and diligence, either in ruling the one or regaining the other, which he thought necessary, and therefore he prevailed with the primate of Numidia to come and ordain one Antonius to be bishop there. And this was consonant to the rules of the African Church, which allowed new bishoprics to be erected in any diocese where there was need[96], if the bishop of the diocese and the primate gave their consent to it; or, as Ferrandus[97] has it in his Collection, 'if the bishop, the primate, and a provincial council, by their joint consent and authority, gave way to it.' By virtue of these canons, during the time of the schism of the Donatists, many new bishoprics were erected in very small towns in Afric, as appears from the Acts of the Collation of Carthage, where the Catholics and Donatists mutually charge each other with this practice:—'that they divided single bishopries sometimes into three or four, and made bishops in country towns and villages to augment the numbers of their parties.' Thus, in one place[98], we find Petilian the Donatist complaining, 'that the Catholics had made four bishops in the diocese of Januarius, a Donatist bishop, to outdo them with numbers;' and, in another place[99], Alypius the Catholic orders it to be entered upon record, that a great many Donatist bishops there mentioned 'were not ordained in cities, but only in country towns or villages.' To

[96] Vid. C. Carth. 2. c. 5. (t. 2. p. 1160 a.) Et si, accedente tempore, crescente fide, Dei populus multiplicatus desideraverit proprium habere rectorem, ejus videlicet voluntate, in cujus potestate est diœcesis constituta, habeat episcopum.—Conf. C. Carth. 3. c. 42. (ibid. p. 1173 e.) Multis in concilio hoc statutum est a cœtu sacerdotali, ut plebes, quæ in diœcesibus ab episcopis retinentur, quæ episcopum numquam habuerunt, non nisi cum voluntate ejus episcopi, a quo tenentur, proprios accipiant rectores, id est, episcopos.

[97] Breviar. c. 13. (ap. Justel. Bibl. Jur. Canon. t. 1. p. 448.) Ut episcopus non ordinetur in diœcesi, quæ episcopum nunquam habuit, nisi cum voluntate episcopi, ad quem ipsa diœcesis pertinet, ex concilio tamen plenario et primatis authoritate.

[98] Collat. Carth. 1. c. 117. (CC. t. 2. p. 1377 a.) Petilianus episcopus dixit: In una plebe Januarii collegæ nostri præsentis, in una diœcesi, quatuor sunt constituti contra ipsum; ut numerus scilicet augeretur.

[99] C. 181. (ibid. p. 1399 b.).... Alypius dixit: Scriptum sit istos omnes in villis vel in fundis esse episcopos ordinatos, non in aliquibus civitatibus.

which Petilian replies[1], 'that the Catholics did the same; ordaining bishops in country towns, and sometimes in such places where they had no people.' His meaning is, that in those places all the people were turned Donatists; and for that very reason the Catholic bishops thought themselves obliged to divide their dioceses, and ordain new bishops in small towns, that they might outdo the Donatists both in number and zeal, and more effectually labour in reducing the straying people back again to their ancient communion with the Catholic Church. This was the practice of Afric, and this their reason for erecting so many small bishoprics in those times of exigency; they had always an eye to the benefit and edification of the Church.

Gregory Nazianzen highly commends St. Basil's piety and prudence for the like practice. It happened in his time, that Cappadocia was divided into two provinces, and Tyana made the metropolis of the second province, in the civil account: this gave occasion to Anthimus, bishop of Tyana, to lay claim to the rights of a metropolitan in the Church, which St. Basil opposed, as injurious to his own Church of Cæsarea; which, by ancient custom and prescription, had been the metropolis of the whole province. But Anthimus proving a very contentious adversary, and raising great disturbance and commotions about it, St. Basil was willing to buy the peace of the Church with the loss of his own rights: so he voluntarily relinquished his jurisdiction over that part of Cappadocia which Anthimus laid claim to, and, to compensate his own loss in some measure, he erected several new bishoprics in his own province, as at Sasima and some other such obscure places of that region. Now though this was done contrary to the letter of a canon, yet Nazianzen extols the fact upon three accounts: first, because hereby a greater care was taken of men's souls; secondly, by this means every city had its own revenues; and, lastly, the war between the two metropolitans was ended. 'This,' he says[2], 'was an admirable policy, worthy the great and noble

[1] Ibid. c. 182. (c.) Petilianus episcopus dixit: Sic etiam tu multos habes per omnes agros dispersos. Immo crebros ubi habes, sane et sine populis habes.

[2] Orat. 20. de Laud. Basil. (t. 1. p. 356 b.) *Σκοπῶμεν, ὡς μεγάλην καὶ θαυμασίαν [τοῦ κακοῦ λύσιν] καὶ τί γὰρ ἢ τῆς ἐκείνου ψυχῆς ἀξίαν· προσθήκην γὰρ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ποιεῖται τὴν στάσιν· καὶ τὴν συμφορὰν ὡς κάλλιστα διατίθεται, πλείοσιν ἐπισκόποις*

soul of St. Basil, who could turn a dispute so to the benefit of the Church, and draw a considerable advantage out of a calamity, by making it an occasion to guard and defend his country with more bishops.' Whence we may collect, that in Nazianzen's opinion it is an advantage to the Church to be well stocked with bishops, and that it is no dishonour to her to have bishops in small towns when necessity and reason require it.

CHAPTER XIII.

Of the rule which forbids two bishops to be ordained in one city.

e general rule and practice of the Church, have but one bishop in a city.

1. ANOTHER rule generally observed in the Church was, that *in one city there should be but one bishop*, though it was large enough to admit of many presbyters. In the time of Cornelius there were forty-six presbyters[3] in the Church of Rome, seven deacons, as many sub-deacons, and ninety-four of the inferior orders of the clergy: and the body of the people, at a moderate computation, are reckoned by some[4] to be about fifty thousand, by others[5] to be a far greater number; yet there was but one bishop over all these. So that when Novatian got himself ordained bishop of Rome, in opposition to Cornelius, he was generally condemned over all the world, as transgressing the rule of the Catholic Church. Cyprian[6] delivers it as a maxim upon this occasion, 'that there ought to be but one bishop in a Church at a time, and one judge as the vicegerent of Christ.' 'Therefore,' he says[7], 'Novatian was no bishop, since there could not be a second after the first; but he was an

τὴν πατρίδα καταπυκνώσας· ἐξ οὗ τί γίνεται; τρία τὰ κάλλιστα· ψυχῶν ἐπιμέλεια πλείων, καὶ τὸ πόλιν ἑκάστην τὸ ἑαυτῆς ἔχειν, καὶ τὸ λυθῆναι ταύτῃ τὸν πόλεμον.

[3] Ep. ad Fab. ap. Euseb. l. 6. c. 43. (v. 1. p. 312. 8.) Ὁ ἐκδικητὴς οὖν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου οὐκ ἠπίστατο ἕνα ἐπίσκοπον δεῖν εἶναι ἐν καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ· ἐν ᾗ οὐκ ἠγνόει· πῶς γάρ; πρεσβυτέρους εἶναι τεσσαράκοντα ἕξ· διακόνους ἑπτά· ὑποδιακόνους ἑπτά· ἀκολούθους δύο καὶ τεσσαράκοντα· ἐξορκιστὰς δὲ καὶ ἀναγνώστας ἅμα πυλωροῖς δύο καὶ πεντήκοντα.

[4] Bp. Burnet, Letter 4. (p. 207.) So that about 50 thousand is the highest account to which we can reasonably raise the numbers of the Christians at Rome at that time, &c.

[5] Basnag. Exercit. in Baron. an. 44. n. 22. (p. 522.) Ad numerum tot hominum Christi numini venerationem exhibentium, &c.

[6] Ep. 53. [al. 59.] ad Cornel. p. 129. (p. 262.) .... Unus in ecclesia ad tempus sacerdos, et ad tempus judex vice Christi.

[7] Ep. 52. [al. 55.] ad Antonian. p. 104. (p. 243.) Cum post primum secundus esse non possit, quisquis post unum, qui solus esse debeat, factus est, non jam secundus ille, sed nullus est.

adulterer[8], and a foreigner, and an ambitious usurper of another man's church, who had been regularly ordained before him.' And so he was told not only by Cyprian[9], but [by] a whole African Council at once; who, in return to Novatian's communicatory letter, which (according to custom) he wrote to them upon his ordination, sent him this plain and positive answer; 'that he was an alien, and that none of them could communicate with him, who had attempted to erect a profane altar, and set up an adulterous chair, and offer sacrilegious sacrifice against Cornelius, the true bishop; who had been ordained by the approbation of God, and the suffrage of the clergy and people.' There were, indeed, some confessors at Rome, who at first sided with Novatian: but Cyprian[10] wrote a remonstrating letter to them, wherein he soberly laid before them the sinfulness of their practice; and his admonition wrought so effectually on some of the chief of them, that not long after they returned to Cornelius, and publicly confessed their fault in these words[11]: 'We acknowledge our error; we have been imposed upon and deluded by treacherous and deceitful words: for though we seemed to communicate with a schismatical and heretical man, yet our mind was always sincerely in the

[8] Ibid. p. 112. (p. 249.) Nisi si episcopus tibi videtur, qui, episcopo in ecclesia a sedecim coepiscopis facto, adulter atque extraneus, episcopus fieri a desertoribus per ambitum nititur.

[9] Ep. 67. [al. 68.] ad Steph. p. 177. (p. 292.) Se foris esse cœpisse, nec posse a quoquam nostrum sibi communicari; qui, episcopo Cornelio in catholica ecclesia de Dei judicio, et cleri ac plebis suffragio ordinato, profanum altare erigere, adulteram cathedram collocare, et sacrilega contra verum sacerdotem sacrificia offerre, tentaverit.

[10] Ep. 44. [al. 46.] ad Nicostrat. et Maxim. (p. 232.) Gravat enim me atque contristat, et ..... cum vos illic comperissem contra ecclesiasticam dispositionem, contra evangelicam legem, contra institutionis catholicæ unitatem, alium episcopum fieri consensisse, id est, quod nec fas est, nec licet fieri, ecclesiam aliam constitui; Christi membra discerpi, Dominici gregis animum et corpus unum discissa æmulatione lacerari. Quod quæso ut, in vobis saltem, illicitum istud fraternitatis nostræ discidium non perseveret, sed, et confessionis vestræ et divinæ traditionis memores, ad matrem revertamini unde prodiistis. Nec putetis, sic vos evangelium Christi asserere, dum vosmet ipsos a Christi grege, et ab ejus pace et concordia separatis, &c.

[11] Ep. 46. [al. 49.] ad Cypr. (p. 235.) Nos errorem nostrum confitemur. Circumventi sumus perfidia et loquacitate captiosa: nam, etsi videbamur quasi quandam communicationem cum schismatico et hæretico homine habuisse, sincera tamen mens nostra semper in ecclesia fuit. Nec enim ignoramus unum Deum esse, unum Christum Dominum, quem confessi sumus, unum Spiritum Sanctum, unum episcopum in catholica ecclesia esse debere.

Church: for we are not ignorant, that as there is but one God, one Christ the Lord, and one Holy Spirit, so there ought to be but one bishop in a Catholic church.' Pamelius[12] and others, who take this for a confession of the bishop of Rome's supremacy, betray either gross ignorance, or great partiality for a cause: for though this was spoken of a bishop of Rome, yet it was not peculiar to him, but the common case of bishops in all churches. Ignatius, and all the writers after him, who have said any thing of bishops, always speak of a single bishop in every church. And though Origen seems to say otherwise, that there were two bishops in every church, yet, as he explains his own notion, his meaning is the same with all the rest: for he says[13], 'the one was visible, the other invisible; the one an angel, the other a man.' So that his testimony (though there be something peculiar in his notion) is a further confirmation of the Church's practice.

The writers of the following ages[14] do so frequently mention

[12] Not. in loc. [Fell, in eund. loc. (p. 235. n. 2.) Pamelium non piguit dicere, *Unum episcopum simpliciter pro Romano episcopo accipi.* Ed.]

[13] Hom. 13. in Luc. (t. 3. p. 947 a.) Per singulas ecclesias bini sunt episcopi, alius visibilis, alius invisibilis .... Ego puto inveniri simul posse et angelum et hominem, bonos [leg. binos] ecclesiæ episcopos.

[14] Chrysost. Ep. 125. [Savil. 143.] ad Cyriac. (t. 3. p. 670 e.) Ὁ γὰρ προβατόσχημος ἐκεῖνος λύκος, ὁ σχῆμα μὲν ἔχων ἐπισκόπου, μοιχὸς δὲ ὑπάρχων· ὡς γὰρ ἡ γυνὴ μοιχαλὶς χρηματίσει, ἡ ζῶντος τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἑτέρῳ συναφθεῖσα· οὕτω καὶ αὐτὸς μοιχός ἐστιν, οὐ σαρκὸς, ἀλλὰ πνεύματος· ζῶντος γὰρ ἐμοῦ, ἡρπασέ μου τὸν θρόνον τῆς ἐκκλησίας. — Hom. 1. in Phil. (t. 11. p. 194 f.) .... Συνεπισκόποις καὶ διακόνοις· τί τοῦτο; μιᾶς πόλεως πολλοὶ ἐπίσκοποι ἦσαν· οὐδαμῶς.—Hieron. Ep. 4. [al. 125.] ad Rustic. (t. 1. p. 936 c.) Singuli ecclesiarum episcopi, singuli archipresbyteri, singuli archidiaconi: et omnis ordo ecclesiasticus suis rectoribus nititur. In navi unus gubernator: in domo unus dominus.— Ep. 85. [al. 146.] ad Evagr. [Evang.] (t. 1. p. 1075 b. n. 1.) Ne quis contentiose in una ecclesia plures episcopos fuisse contendat ... nam et Alexandriæ a Marco evangelista usque ad Heraclam .... presbyteri semper unum ex se electum, in excelsiori gradu collocatum, episcopum nominabant. — Pseud-Hieron. 1 Tim. 3. (t. 11. p. 1048 a.) Cum una civitas plures episcopos habere non posset.—Hil. Diacon. in Phil. 1, 1. (Oper. Ambros. t. 2. append. p. 251 c.) Si episcopis scriberet et diaconibus, ad personas eorum scriberet, et loci ipsius episcopo scribendum erat, non duobus vel tribus. [Conf. Pseud-Hieron. in Phil. 1, 1. (t. 11. p. 1011 e.) Hic episcopos presbyteros intelligimus, &c. Ed.] — In 1 Cor. 12, 28. (Oper. Ambros. ibid. p. 153 f.) ..... Et quia ab uno Deo Patre sunt omnia, singulos episcopos singulis ecclesiis præesse decrevit.—In 1 Tim. 3, 12. (ibid. p. 295 e.) Nunc septem diaconos esse oportet et aliquantos presbyteros, ut bini sint per ecclesias, et unus in civitate episcopus.—Pacian. Ep. 3. ad Sempron. (ap. Galland. t. 7. p. 263 d.) .. Ille [Novatus,] sedente jam Romæ episcopo, adversum fas sacerdotii singularis, alterius episcopi sibi no-

the same thing, that it would be as tedious, as it is needless, to recite their testimonies. Therefore I shall only add these two things. First, that the Council of Nice[15] repeats and confirms this ancient rule: for in the eighth canon, which speaks of the Novatian bishops that return to the Catholic Church, it is said, that any bishop may admit them to officiate as presbyters in the city, or as *chorepiscopi* in the country, but not as city bishops, for this reason, *ἵνα μὴ ἐν τῇ πόλει δύο ἐπίσκοποι ὦσιν, that there may not be two bishops in one city.* Secondly, that in fact the people were generally possessed with the opinion of the absolute unlawfulness of having two bishops sit together: insomuch that Theodoret[16] tells us, when Constantius proposed to the Roman people to have Liberius and Felix sit as co-partners, and govern the Church in common, they unanimously agreed to reject the motion, crying out, 'One God, one Christ, one Bishop!'

Yet two bishops sometimes allowed by compromise, to end a dispute, or cure an inveterate schism.

2. Yet it must be observed, that as the great end and design of this rule was to prevent schism, and preserve the peace and unity of the Church; so, on the other hand, when it manifestly appeared that the allowing of two bishops in one city, in some certain circumstances and critical junctures, was the only way to put an end to some long and inveterate schism; in that case there were some Catholic bishops who were willing to take a partner into their throne, and share the episcopal power and dignity between them. Thus Meletius, bishop of Antioch, made the proposal to Paulinus his antagonist, who, though he was of the same faith, yet kept up a church divided in communion from him. I shall relate the proposal in the words of Theo-

men assumit.—Socrat. l. 6. c. 22. (v. 2. p. 341. 5.) Ἰωάννου δὲ ποτὲ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου ἐγκαλοῦντος αὐτῷ, καὶ λέγοντος, ὅτι οὐ δύναται ἡ πόλις δύο ἐπισκόπους ἔχειν, ὁ Σισίννιος ἔφη, Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἔχει.—Sozom. l. 4. c. 15. (ibid. p. 150. 31.) Ὀλίγον δὲ χρόνον Φίληκος ἐπιβιώσαντος, μόνος Λιβέριος τῆς ἐκκλησίας προΐστατο· ταύτῃ πῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ διοικήσαντος, ὥστε τὸν Πέτρου θρόνον μὴ ἀδοξεῖν, ὑπὸ δύο ἡγεμόσιν ἰθυνόμενον· ὁ διχονοίας σύμβολόν ἐστι, καὶ ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ θεσμοῦ ἀλλότριον.—Theodor. l. 3. c. 4. (v. 3. p. 125. 38.) Καὶ γὰρ ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ, διχῇ τὸ ὑγιαῖνον σῶμα τῆς ἐκκλησίας διῃρητο, κ. τ. λ.

[15] [C. 8. (t. 2. p. 33 b.) Ὁ ὀνομαζόμενος παρὰ τοῖς λεγομένοις Καθαροῖς ἐπίσκοπος, τὴν τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου τιμὴν ἕξει· πλὴν εἰ μὴ ἄρα δοκοίη τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ τῆς τιμῆς τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτὸν μετέχειν· εἰ δὲ τοῦτο αὐτῷ μὴ ἀρέσκοι, ἐπινοήσει τόπον ἢ χωρεπισκόπου ἢ πρεσβυτέρου, ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ ὅλως δοκεῖν εἶναι, ἵνα μὴ ἐν τῇ πόλει δύο ἐπίσκοποι ὦσιν. *Grischov.*]

[16] L. 2. c. 17. (v. 3. p. 96. 28.) Εἷς Θεὸς, εἷς Χριστὸς, εἷς ἐπίσκοπος.

doret[17]: 'Meletius,' says he, 'the meekest of men, thus friendly and mildly addressed himself to Paulinus; "Forasmuch as the Lord hath committed to me the care of these sheep, and thou hast received the care of others, and all the sheep agree in one common faith, let us join our flocks, my friend, and dispute no longer about primacy and government; but let us feed the sheep in common, and bestow a common care upon them. And if it be the throne that creates the dispute, I will try to take away that cause also. We will lay the holy Gospel upon the seat, and then each of us take his place on either side of it. And if I die first, you shall take the government of the flock alone; but if it be your fate to die before me, then I will feed them according to my power." Thus spake the divine Meletius,' says our author, 'lovingly and meekly; but Paulinus would not acquiesce, nor hearken to him.'

We meet with another such proposal made to the Donatist bishops by all the Catholic bishops of Afric assembled together at the opening of the famous Conference of Carthage. There they offered them freely, before the Conference began, 'that if they would return to the unity and communion of the Church, upon due conviction, they should retain their episcopal honour and dignity still[18];' and because this could not be done,

[17] L. 5. c. 3. (ibid. p. 196. 5.) Μελέτιος δὲ, ὁ πάντων ἀνθρώπων πρᾳότατος, φιλοφρόνως ἅμα καὶ ἠπίως ἔφη πρὸς τὸν Παυλῖνον· Ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἐμοὶ τῶνδε τῶν προβάτων τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν ὁ τῶν προβάτων ἐνεχείρισε Κύριος, καὶ σὺ τῶν ἄλλων ἀναδέδεξαι τὴν φροντίδα, κοινωνεῖ δὲ ἀλλήλοις τῆς εὐσεβείας τὰ θρέμματα, συνάψωμεν, ὦ φιλότης, τὰ ποίμνια, καὶ τὴν περὶ τῆς ἡγεμονίας καταλύσωμεν διαμάχην· κοινῇ δὲ τὰ πρόβατα νέμοντες, κοινὴν αὐτοῖς προσενέγκωμεν θεραπείαν· εἰ δὲ ὁ μέσος θῶκος τὴν ἔριν γεννᾷ, ἐγὼ καὶ ταύτην ἐξελάσαι πειράσομαι· ἐν γὰρ τούτῳ τὸ θεῖον προτεθεικὼς εὐαγγέλιον, ἑκατέρωθεν ἡμᾶς καθῆσθαι παρεγγυῶ· καὶ εἰ μὲν πρῶτος ἐγὼ δεξαίμην τοῦ βίου τὸ πέρας, μόνος σχῇς, ὦ φίλος, τὴν τῆς ποίμνης ἡγεμονίαν· εἰ δὲ σὺ πρότερος τοῦτο πάθοις, ἐγὼ πάλιν εἰς δύναμιν τῶν προβάτων ἐπιμελήσομαι. Ταῦτα ἠπίως μὲν ἅμα καὶ φιλοφρόνως θεῖος εἶπε Μελέτιος· ὁ δὲ Παυλῖνος οὐκ ἔστερξεν.

[18] Collat. Carth. die 1. c. 16. (CC. t. 2. p. 1352 c.) Sic nobiscum teneant unitatem, ut non solum viam salutis inveniant, sed nec honorem episcopatus amittant..... Poterit quippe unusquisque nostrum, honoris sibi socio copulato, vicissim sedere eminentius, sicut peregrino episcopo juxta considente collega. Hoc cum alternis basilicis utrisque conceditur, uterque ab alterutro honore mutuo prævenitur. Quia ubi præceptio charitatis dilataverit corda, possessio pacis non fit angusta, ut uno eorum defuncto, deinceps jam singulis singuli, pristino more, succedant. Nec novum aliquid fiet. Nam hoc ab ipsius separationis exordio, in eis qui, damnato nefariæ discessionis errore, unitatis dulcedinem vel sero sapuerunt, catholica dilectio custodivit. Aut si forte Christiani populi sin-

s the circumstances and case of the Church then were, without allowing two bishops for some time to be in the same city, t was further proposed; 'that every Catholic bishop should ake the other to be his co-partner and share the honour with him; allowing him to sit with him in his own chair, as was usual for bishops to treat their fellow bishops that were strangers; and also granting him a church of his own, where he might be capable of returning him the like civility; that so they might pay mutual respect and honour to each other, and take their turns to sit highest in the church, till such time as one of them should die; and then the right of succession should be always in a single bishop, as it was before.' 'And this,' they say, 'was no new thing in Afric; for from the beginning of the schism, they, that would recant their error and condemn their separation and return to the unity of the Church, were by the charity of Catholics always treated in the same courteous manner.' From hence it is plain that this had been the practice of Afric for above one whole century; and the present bishops proposed to follow the example of their predecessors, in making this concession to the Donatists, in order to close up and heal the divisions of the Church. But they add, 'that forasmuch as this method might not be acceptable to all Christian people, who would be much better pleased to see only a single bishop in every church, and perhaps would not endure the partnership of two, which was an unusual thing; they therefore proposed in this case, that both the bishops should freely resign, and suffer a single bishop to be chosen by such bishops as were singly possessed of other churches.' So that at once they testify both what was the usual and ordinary rule of the Church, to have but one bishop in a city, and also how far they were willing to have receded, in order to establish the peace and unity of the Church in that extraordinary juncture.

I have been the more easily tempted to recite this passage at large, not only because it is a full proof of all that has been

gulis delectantur episcopis, et duorum consortium, inusitata rerum facie, tolerare non possunt. Utrique de medio secedamus; et ecclesiis in singulis, damnata schismatis causa, in unitate pacifica constitutis, ab his, qui singuli in ecclesiis singulis invenientur, unitati factæ per longa necessaria singuli constituantur episcopi.

asserted in this chapter, but because it gives us such an instance of a noble, self-denying zeal and charity, as is scarce to be paralleled in any history; and shews us the admirable spirit of those holy bishops, among whom St. Austin was a leader.

The opinions of learned men concerning two bishops in a city in the apostolical age, one of the Jews, and the other of the Gentiles.

3. Some very learned persons[19] are further of opinion, that this rule about one bishop in a city did not take place in the apostolical age; for they think that before the perfect incorporation and coalition of Jews and Gentiles into one body, there were two bishops in many cities, one of the Jews and another of the Gentiles. Thus they think it was at Antioch, where Euodius and Ignatius are said to be bishops, ordained by the Apostles; as also Linus and Clemens at Rome, the one ordained by St. Peter bishop of the Jews, and the other by St. Paul bishop of the Gentiles. Epiphanius seems to have been of this opinion; for he says[20], Peter and Paul were the first bishops of Rome; and he makes it a question, whether they did not ordain two other bishops to supply their places in their absence. In another place[21] he takes occasion to say, 'that Alexandria never had two bishops, as other churches had;' which observation Bishop Pearson thinks[22] ought to be extended to the apostolical ages, as implying that St. Mark, being the only preacher of the Gospel at Alexandria, left but one bishop his successor: but in other churches, sometimes two Apostles gathered churches, and each of them left a bishop in his place. Yet this does not satisfy other learned persons[23],

[19] Pearson, Vind. Ignat. part. 2. c. 13. (Cotel. v. 2. p. 414.) Duas enim in quibusdam civitatibus, temporibus apostolorum, ecclesias, duos episcopos fuisse, donec Gentiles cum Judæis in unum corpus coalescerent, probatissimum ex ipsis scriptis apostolicis facit Hammondus noster. —See Hammond, Dissert. 5. adv. Blondel. c. 1. s. 21. (v. 4. p. 826.) Tunc certe constitutioni isti locus fuit, &c.

[20] Hær. 27. Carpocrat. n. 6. (t. 1. p. 107 a.) Ἐν γὰρ Ῥώμῃ γεγόνασι πρῶτοι Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος, οἱ ἀπόστολοι αὐτοὶ καὶ ἐπίσκοποι.

[21] Hær. 68. Melet. n. 6. (p. 722 c.) Οὐ γάρ ποτε ἡ Ἀλεξάνδρια δύο ἐπισκόπους ἔσχεν, ὡς αἱ ἄλλαι πόλεις.

[22] [Pearson, Vind. Ignat. part. 2. c. 13. sub fin. (Cotel. v. 2. p. 414.) Quæ observatio ad apostolica etiam tempora extendi sine dubio debet; quod Marcus, cum solus ibi [Alexandriæ] prædicaverit, unicum episcopum successorem reliquit; in aliis autem civitatibus aliquando duo apostoli ecclesias congregabant, et loco suo quisque episcopum reliquit. *Grischov.*]

[23] Cotel. Not. in Constit. Apost. l. 7. c. 46. (v. 1. p. 383.) Jam vero ex apostolici constitutoris verbis concludunt viri docti, Euodium et Ignatium simul fuisse Antiochiæ episcopos, illum Gentibus datum, hunc Judæis ... Subtiliter profecto et ingeniose hæc, ac si vis etiam

who are of a different judgment, and think that though the Apostles had occasion to ordain two bishops in some cities, yet it was not upon the account of different churches of Jews and Gentiles, but in the ordinary way of succession; as Ignatius was ordained at Antioch after the death of Euodius, and Clemens at Rome after the death of Linus. I shall not pretend to determine on which side the right lies in so nice a dispute[24], but leave it to the judicious reader, and only say, that if the former opinion prevails, it proves another exception to the common rule of having but one bishop in a city; or rather shews what was the practice of the Church before the rule was made.

The case of coadjutors.

4. To these we may add a third exception, in a case that is more plain; which was that of *the coadjutors*. These were such bishops as were ordained to assist some other bishops in case of infirmity or old age, and were to be subordinate to them as long as they lived, and succeed them when they died. Thus, when Narcissus, bishop of Jerusalem, was disabled by reason of his great age, being a hundred and twenty years old, Alexander was made his coadjutor. Eusebius[25] and St. Jerom both say it was done by revelation; but they do not mean that Narcissus needed a revelation to authorize him to take a coadjutor, but only to point out to him that particular man. For Alexander was a stranger, and a bishop already in another country, so that without a revelation he could not have been judged qualified for this office; but being once declared to be so, there was no scruple upon any other account; but, by the unanimous consent[26] of all the bishops in Palestine, he was chosen to take part with Narcissus in the care and government of the church. Valesius[27] reckons this the first instance

verisimiliter: mihi tamen res non persuadetur facile. Quia quod volunt, non dicit aperte Constitutio: immo magis videtur exponenda per communem successionis morem.

[24] Bishop Pearson himself altered his opinion. See his Dissert. 2. de Success. Rom. Pontif. c. 3. (int. Oper. posthum. Oxf. 1844. v. 2. p. 449.) The title, Unde ortum habuerit opinio de pluribus Romæ uno tempore sedentibus episcopis, &c.

[25] L. 6. c. 11. (v. 1. p. 268. 17.) *Καὶ δὴ μηκέθ' οἵουτε ὄντος λειτουργεῖν διὰ λιπαρὸν γῆρας, τὸν εἰρημένον Ἀλέξανδρον, ἐπίσκοπον ἑτέρας ὑπάρχοντα παροικίας, οἰκονομία Θεοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν ἅμα τῷ Ναρκίσσῳ λειτουργίαν ἐκάλει, κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν νύκτωρ αὐτῷ δι' ὁράματος φανεῖσαν.*

[26] Hieron. de Scriptor. Eccles. in Alexandro. (t. 2. p. 887.) Cunctis in Palæstina episcopis in unum congregatis, adnitente quoque ipso vel maxime Narcisso, Hierosolymitanæ ecclesiæ cum eo gubernaculum suscepit.

[27] Not. in Euseb. l. c. (ibid. n. 3.)

of any coadjutor to be met with in ancient history; but there are several examples in the following ages. Theotecnus, bishop of Cæsarea, made Anatolius his coadjutor, designing him to be his successor, so that for some time they both[28] governed the same church together. Maximus is said by Sozomen[29] to be bishop of Jerusalem together with Macarius. Orion, bishop of Palæbisca, being grown old, ordained Siderius his coadjutor and successor, as Synesius[30] informs us. So Theodoret[31] takes notice that John, bishop of Apamea, had one Stephen for his colleague. And St. Ambrose[32] mentions one Senecio, who was coadjutor to Bassus. In the same manner Gregory Nazianzen was bishop of Nazianzum, together with his aged father. Baronius[33], indeed, denies that ever he was bishop of Nazianzum; but St. Jerom[34], and all the ancient

.... In hac Alexandri electione duo contra ecclesiasticam regulam admissa sunt. Primum, quod ab uno episcopatu Alexander ad alium translatus est. Alterum, quod superstiti episcopo adjutor et coepiscopus est adjunctus. Atque hoc primum exemplum occurrit coadjutorum episcoporum.

[28] Euseb. l. 7. c. 32. (ibid. p. 370. 27.) Τούτῳ πρῶτος ὁ τῆς Παλαιστινῶν Καισαρείας ἐπίσκοπος, Θεότεκνος, χεῖρας εἰς ἐπισκοπὴν ἐπιτέθεικε, διάδοχον ἑαυτοῦ μετὰ τελευτὴν πορισεῖσθαι τῇ ἰδίᾳ παροικίᾳ προνοούμενος· καὶ δὴ ἐπὶ σμικρόν τινα χρόνον ἄμφω τῆς αὐτῆς προὔστησαν ἐκκλησίας.

[29] L. 2. c. 20. (v. 2. p. 70. 15.) .... Ἔδοξεν εὖ ἔχειν, Διοσπολίταις μὲν ἕτερον αἱρεῖσθαι ἐπίσκοπον· Μάξιμον δὲ ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις μεῖναι, καὶ Μακαρίῳ συνιερᾶσθαι.

[30] Ep. 67. (p. 209 d 2.) Καὶ ἐπειδὰν παρέτεινε ζῶν, οὐκ ἀνασχέσθαι περιμεῖναι τοῦ δικαίου τὴν τελευτὴν, ἀλλὰ προβαλέσθαι μακαρίτην Σιδήριον.

[31] L. 5. c. 4. (v. 3. p. 177. 22.) Οὗτος ἐν τῷ τῆς ζάλης καιρῷ, τὸν τῶν ὁμοπίστων ἐκυβέρνησε σύλλογον· σύνεργον δὲ εἶχε τὸν ἀξιέπαινον Στέφανον.

[32] Ep. 79. ad Theophil. [al. 56. int. Epp. de Caus. Bonosi] (t. 2. p. 1009 e.) Fratri nostro et coepiscopo Basso in consortium regendæ ecclesiæ datus est Senecio.

[33] An. 371. n. 106. (t. 4. p. 307 b.) At illud de Gregorio plane accidit admiratione dignum, quod omnes ipsum episcopum Nazianzenum affirment, hæcque opinio apud omnes ferme adeo invaluerit, ut nec ea de re dubitandi saltem locum admiserint. Et quid mirum, si posteri eo errore lapsi sunt, cum hoc ipsum crediderint homines hujus temporis, iique præsertim, qui in Concilio Constantinopolitano eidem refragati sunt, dicentes ipsum trium sedium episcopum esse, nempe Sasimorum, Nazianzi, atque Constantinopolis? Cum igitur id de eo creditum atque scriptum appareat, et ejusmodi causa eo statu collocata esse videatur, ut contrarium testem admittat neminem, in aliorum quoque sententiam et ego pedibus irem, nisi, quod instar omnium est et plus omnibus æstimari debet, ipsemet Gregorius contrarium affirmaret.

[34] De Scriptor. Eccles. (t. 2. p. 929.) Gregorius primum Sasimorum, deinde Nazianzenus episcopus, &c.—Vid. August. Ep. 110. [al. 213.] Acta in designando Eradio presbytero. (t. 2. p. 790 a, b.) Quod ergo reprehensum est in me, nolo reprehendi in filio meo..... Erit presbyter ut est, quando Deus voluerit futurus episcopus.

historians, Socrates[35], Sozomen[36], Ruffin[37], and Theodoret[38], expressly assert it: though some of them mistake in calling him his father's successor; for he was no otherwise bishop of Nazianzum, but only as his father's coadjutor. He entered upon the office with this protestation, 'that he would not be obliged to continue bishop there any longer than his father lived,' as he himself acquaints us in his own Life[39], and other places. So that after his father's death he actually resigned, and, getting Eulalius to be ordained in his room, he betook himself[40] to a private life; all which evidently proves that he was not his father's successor, but only his coadjutor. I will but add one instance more of this nature, which is the known case of St. Austin, who was ordained bishop of Hippo whilst Valèrius was living, and sat with him[41] for some time as his coadjutor; which he did by the consent of the primate of Carthage, and the primate of Numidia, who ordained him. Possidius says[42], 'he had some scruple upon him at first because

[35] L. 4. c. 26. (v. 2. p. 247. 3.) Γρηγόριος τῆς Ναζιανζοῦ, πόλεως εὐτελοῦς ἐν Καππαδοκίᾳ, ἧς καὶ ὁ αὐτοῦ πατὴρ πρότερον ἐκκλησίας προέστη, κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ τῷ Βασιλείῳ διεπράττετο.

[36] L. 6. c. 17. (ibid. p. 239. 36.) Γρηγόριος Ναζιανζοῦ, πόλεως μικρᾶς, ἐπισκοπεῖν μετὰ τὸν αὐτοῦ πατέρα λαχών.

[37] L. 2. [al. 11.] c. 9. (p. 249 b. 4.) Gregorius vero apud Nazianzon oppidum in locum patris episcopus subrogatus, &c.

[38] L. 5. c. 8. (v. 3. p. 201. 13.) Κατ' ἐκεῖνον δὲ τὸν χρόνον ὁ τὴν Ναζιανζὸν τὰ τελευταῖα ποιμάνας ἐν Κωνσταντινωπόλει διέτριβε.

[39] Carm. de Vit. sua (t. 2. p. 9 a.)
Ἐνουθέτησ' ἐμαυτὸν, ὡς οὐδὲν βλάβος
Ἕως καθέδρας πατρὸς ἐκπλῆσαι πόθον.
Οὐ γὰρ καθέξει τοῦτ' (ἔφην) ἄκοντά με,
Ὃν οὔτε κήρυγμ', οὔθ' ὑπόσχεσις κρατεῖ.
Οὕτως ἀνήγαγέ με νικήσας φόβος.
Ἐπεὶ δ' ὑπεξῆλθον μὲν οἱ γονεῖς βίου,
Κλῆρον λαχόντες, εἰς ὃν ἔσπευδον πάλαι,
Ἐγὼ δ' ἐλείφθην οὐ καλῶς ἐλεύθερος,
Τῆς μὲν δοθείσης οὐ δόλως ἐκκλησίας
Προσηψάμην, οὐδ' ὅσσον λατρείαν μίαν
Θεῷ προσενεγκεῖν, ἢ συνεύξασθαι λαῷ,
Ἡ χεῖρα θεῖναι κληρικῶν ἑνί γέ τῳ.
— Orat. 8. ad Patr. (t. 1. p. 148 c.) Διὰ τοῦτο νῦν μὲν δέχομαι τῷ καλῷ πατρὶ συνδιαφέρειν τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν, ὥσπερ ἀετῷ μεγάλῳ καὶ ὑψιπέτῃ νεοσσὸς οὐκ ἄχρηστος, ἐγγύθεν συμπαριπτάμενος· μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο, δώσω τῷ πνεύματι τὴν ἐμὴν πτέρυγα, φέρειν ᾗ βούλεται καὶ ὡς βούλεται, καὶ οὐδεὶς ὁ βιασάμενος οὐδὲ ἀπάξων ἑτέρωθι μετὰ τούτου βουλευόμενον.

[40] Ep. 42. ad Greg. Nyss. (t. 1. p. 804 a.) Ὃν καὶ εἰς χείρας σου τίθημι, τὸν αἰδεσιμώτατον Εὐλάλιον κ. τ. λ.

[41] Possid. Vit. August. c. 8. See before, ch. 11. s. 7. p. 141. n. 67.—Conf. Paulin. Ep. 46. ad Romanian. (p. 402.) (int. Oper. August. Ep. 32. t. 2. p. 58 g.).... Qui [Augustinus] ad majorem Dominici muneris gratiam novo more provectus, ita consecratus est, ut non succederet in cathedra episcopo, sed accederet. Nam incolumi Valerio Hipponensis ecclesiæ coepiscopus Augustinus est, &c.—August. Ep. 34. [al. 31.] (t. 2. p. 56 d.) Sed qua ecclesiæ cura tenear, ex hoc vestra caritas oportet attendat, quod beatissimus pater Valerius..... nec presbyterum me esse suum passus est, nisi majorem mihi coepiscopatus sarcinam imponeret.

[42] [Ibid. (t. 10. append. p. 262 e.)

he looked upon it as contrary to the custom of the Church; but being told that it was a thing commonly practised both in the African and Transmarine Churches, he yielded, with some reluctancy, to be ordained.' These instances are evident proof that it was not thought contrary to the true sense of the canon, in case of infirmity or old age, to have coadjutors in the Church. Though, it is true, St. Austin was of opinion that his own ordination was not regular, when afterward he came to know the Nicene canon, which he did not know before; and for this reason he would not ordain Eradius[43] [al. Eraclius] bishop whilst he himself lived, though he had nominated him, with the consent of the Church, to be his successor. But all men did not understand the canon in this strict and rigorous sense that St. Austin did, as absolutely forbidding two bishops to be in a church at the same time, in all cases whatsoever, but only when there was no just reason, and the necessities of the Church did not require it. But if there was a reasonable cause to have more bishops than one, as when a bishop was unable to execute his office, or in any the like case, the canon did not oblige, as appears from the instances that have been mentioned, and several others that might be added to them.

CHAPTER XIV.

Of the Chorepiscopi, Περιοδευταὶ, *and Suffragan Bishops; and how these differed from one another.*

1. As the bishops, when they were disabled by old age or infirmity, ordained themselves coadjutors in the city; so when

....Omnibusque audientibus gratulantibus atque id fieri perficique ingenti desiderio clamantibus, episcopatum suscipere contra morem ecclesiæ, suo vivente episcopo, presbyter recusabat. Dumque illi fieri solere ab omnibus suaderetur, atque id ignaro transmarinis et Africanis ecclesiæ exemplis probaretur, compulsus atque coactus succubuit, et episcopatus curam et majoris loci ordinationem suscepit. Ed.]

[43] Raban. Maur. de Instit. Cler. et Cæremon. l. 1. c. 5. (Coloniæ, 1532. p. 24.) Dicti sunt autem chorepiscopi, quia de choro sunt sacerdotum, &c.—Conf. Salmas. de Primat. c. 1. (p. 10.) Hinc cap. 11. de officio archipresbyteri, *ministerium ejus in eo constitui dicitur, ut diligenti cura provideat ministerium sacerdotum cardinalium.* Quod non de urbis tantum Romæ presbyteris accipiendum, sed de primis sacerdotibus aliarum urbium, quibus parœciæ, id est, tituli commissi. Græcorum infima ætas πρωτοπαστάδας vocavit, qui videntur in locum chorepiscoporum successisse, ut ex Balsamone clarum est; Scholiis in Synodum Antiochenam, c. 8, ubi τοὺς ἐν χώραις πρεσβυτέρους, qui in canone ipso χωρεπίσκοποι vocantur, πρωτοπαστάδας interpretatur.

their dioceses were enlarged, by the conversion of Pagans, in the country and villages at a great distance from the city-church, they created themselves another sort of assistants in the country, whom they called *chorepiscopi;* who were so named, not because they were *ex choro sacerdotum,* as a Latin writer by mistake derives the word, but because they were τῆς χώρας ἐπίσκοποι, *country-bishops,* as the word properly signifies, and not presbyters of the city-regions, as Salmasius understands it.

episcopi, and the mistake of some about it.

2. Now, though the name does in some measure determine their quality, yet great dispute has been among learned men concerning the nature of this order. Among the schoolmen and canonists it is a received opinion, that they were only presbyters; as may be seen in Turrian[44], Estius[45], Antonius Augustinus[46], and Gratian[47]; who are followed not only by Salmasius[48], but by Spalatensis[49], Dr. Field[50], and Dr. Forbes[51], the last of which brings several arguments to prove that they were mere presbyters, and never had any episcopal ordination.

Three different opinions about the nature of this order. First, that they were mere presbyters.

3. Others think there were two sorts of *chorepiscopi,* some that had episcopal ordination, and others that were simple presbyters; which is the opinion of Cabassutius[52], Peter de

A second opinion, that some of them

[44] Not. in C. 54. C. Nicæn. Arab. (CC. t. 2. p. 308 a.) . . . Quod præcipit canon, ut episcopus recitet super chorepiscopum orationem et benedicat ei, declarat quod ait Damasus, fuisse olim chorepiscopos ad formam septuaginta discipulorum, id est, non fuisse ordinem eorum nisi presbyterorum tantum.

[45] In Quatuor Sentent. dist. 34. s. 30. (t. 4. p. 38 e.) Ceterum in ordine episcoporum non sunt censendi chorepiscopi, &c.

[46] Epit. Jur. Canon. l. 6. tit. 1. cc. 8, 11, 13. (t. 1. pp. 274. 275.)

[47] Dist. 6. [corrige, 68.] cc. 4, 5. (t. 1. pp. 344, seqq.) Quamvis chorepiscopis et presbyteris, &c.

[48] De Presbyt. et Episc. c. 5. (p. 315.)

[49] De Republ. part. 1. l. 2. c. 9. nn. 17, 18, 19. (pp. 289, seqq.) Ex hac eadem radice, &c.

[50] Of the Church, b. 5. ch. 29. (pp. 504, seqq.) Of chorepiscopi, or rural bishops, forbidden by old canons to encroach on the episcopal office, &c.

[51] Irenic. l. 2. c. 11. prop. 14. (t. 1. p. 444. n. 2, et seqq.) Fit chorepiscoporum mentio, &c. [Conf. prop. 13. (p. 423. n. 5.) Porro chorepiscopos illos, &c. Ed.]

[52] Notit. Concil. c. 8. p. 45. [Sæc. 4. C. Ancyran. c. 13. p. 95.)] Iste porro Antiochenus canon 10. (conf. Cabassut. ad can. citat. p. 135. Ex isto Antiocheno hæc addisce, &c.) duo circa chorepiscopos edocet. Primum, illos non in civitatibus sed in vicis et minoribus oppidis constitui, &c. Secundo, posse contingere, ut episcopali quoque ordinatione præfulgeant chorepiscopi. Quæ observatio egregie conciliat canonem Antiochenum cum Epistola Decretali Papæ Damasi . . . . quæ negat chorepiscopos ullam habere ordinandi potestatem, eo quod nihil amplius sint quam presbyteri, nec ullatenus episcopi.

Marca[53], and Bellarmin[54]. They all allow that in some cases it happened that the *chorepiscopi* were bishops, because they were ordained bishops *before* they were made *chorepiscopi*. And thus much is certainly true: for in the primitive Church sometimes bishops were ordained to a place, but not received, either through the perverseness of the people, or by reason of persecution, or the like cause; and such bishops, whom the ancient writers[55] and canons term σχολαῖοι and σχολάζοντες ἐπίσκοποι, *vacant bishops*, not being permitted to officiate in their own church, were admitted to act as *chorepiscopi* under any other bishop that would entertain them. The Council of Nice[56] made the like provision for such of the Novatian bishops as would return to the Catholic Church: 'that the bishop of the place should admit them either to the office of a city-presbyter, or of a *chorepiscopus*, that there might not be two bishops in one city.' And so it was determined likewise by the same Council[57], in the case of the Meletian bishops, 'that upon their return to the unity of the Church, they should be allowed to officiate in subordination to the bishops of the Catholic Church.' Now it is plain that all such *chorepiscopi* as these were properly bishops, because they were originally ordained bishops before they came to act in the quality of country-bishops under others. But for all the rest, de Marca thinks they were only presbyters.

4. Both these opinions, which differ little from one another, are rejected by Bp. Barlow[58], Dr. Hammond[59], Dr. Beveridge[60],

[53] De Concord. l. 2. c. 13. n. 2, praesertim. (p. 160.) Ceterum episcopatus apicem non obtinebant, &c.

[54] De Cler. l. 1. c. 17. (t. 2. p. 280.) Diximus de distinctione, &c.

[55] Socrat. l. 4. c. 7. (v. 2. p. 219. 6.) Σχολαῖος δὲ ἐπίσκοπος ἦν.—C. Antioch. c. 16. (t. 2. p. 568 e.) Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος σχολάζων ἐπὶ σχολάζουσαν ἐκκλησίαν ἑαυτὸν ἐπιρρίψας, ἰφαρπάζοι τὸν θρόνον δίχα συνοίδου τελείας, τοῦτον ἀπόβλητον εἶναι.

[56] C. 8. (ibid. p. 33 b.) Ὁ δὲ ὀναμαζόμενος παρὰ τοῖς λεγομένοις Καθαροῖς ἐπίσκοπος, τὴν τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου τιμὴν ἕξει· πλὴν εἰ μὴ ἄρα δοκοίη τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ τῆς τιμῆς τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτὸν μετέχειν· εἰ δὲ τοῦτο αὐτῷ μὴ ἀρέσκοι, ἐπινοήσει τοῦτον ἢ χωρεπισκόπου ἢ πρεσβυτέρου, ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ ὅλως δοκεῖν εἶναι, ἵνα μὴ ἐν τῇ πόλει δύο ἐπίσκοποι ὦσιν.

[57] Ep. Synod. ap. Socrat. l. 1. c. 9. (v. 2. p. 27. 26.) Τοὺς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ κατασταθέντας, μυστικοτέρᾳ χειροτονίᾳ βεβαιωθέντας κοινωνῆσαι ἐπὶ τούτοις, ἐφ' ὥτε ἔχειν μὲν αὐτοὺς τὴν τιμὴν καὶ λειτουργίαν, δευτέρους δὲ εἶναι ἐξάπαντος πάντων τῶν ἐν ἑκάστῃ παροικίᾳ τε καὶ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐξεταζομένων, τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ τιμιωτάτου καὶ συλλειτουργοῦ ἡμῶν Ἀλεξάνδρου προκεχειρισμένων.

[58] Letter to Bishop Usher, in Usher's Works Let. 222. (p. 520.) .. I conceive that it is demonstrable undeniably from the carrying principles in antiquity that they [*the chorepiscopi*] were bishops.

Dr. Cave[61], and even by Mr. Blondel[62] himself, who, though by some reckoned among those of the contrary opinion, has a long dissertation against de Marca, to prove that all the *chorepiscopi*, mentioned in the ancient Councils, were properly bishops. And there needs no fuller proof of this, than what Athanasius says in his Second Apology; where he puts a manifest distinction betwixt presbyters and the *chorepiscopi*. For, speaking of the irregular promotion of Ischyras, who was made bishop of the region of Mareotis by the Eusebian faction, he says[63], 'Mareotis was only a region of Alexandria, and that all the churches of that precinct were immediately subject to the bishop of Alexandria, and never had either bishop or *chorepiscopus* among them, but only presbyters, fixed each in their respective villages or churches.' This, as Blondel[64] well observes, shews evidently that the *chorepiscopi* were not the same with presbyters; however the forger of the Decretal Epistles, under the name of Pope Leo and Damasus, would have persuaded the world to believe so.

were bisho the m proba

5. But why then does the Council of Neocæsarea[65] say that the *chorepiscopi* were only in imitation of the seventy? I answer, because they were subject to the city-bishops, as the seventy elders were subject to Moses, or the seventy disciples to the Apostles. For whatever the Council means by the seventy, it cannot be proved thence that the *chorepiscopi* were mere presbyters.

Some jectio again answ

[59] Dissert. 3. cont. Blondel. c. 8. (v. 4. pp. 787. seqq.) Verum et aliud est, &c.

[60] Pandect. Not. in C. Ancyr. c. 13. (t. 2. append. p. 176.) Nos veram eorum [chorepiscoporum] constitutionem atque officium ex hoc aliisque canonibus elicere moliemur: quibus etiam conficere non dubitamus, veteres chorepiscopos, contra ac pluribus visum est, revera episcopos fuisse, etiamsi episcopalium quarundam functionum exercitia iis a canonibus denegentur, &c.

[61] Cave, Prim. Christ. part. 1. c. 8. p. 224. (p. 108.) Bishops really they were, &c.

[62] Apol. s. 3. (p. 95.) Primam chorepiscoporum memoriam, &c.

[63] Apol. 2. t. 1. p. 802. (t. 1. part. 1. p. 158 b. n. 85.) Ὁ Μαρεώτης... χώρα τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐστὶ, καὶ οὐδέποτε ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ γέγονεν ἐπίσκοπος, οὐδὲ χωρεπίσκοπος· ἀλλὰ τῷ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπισκόπῳ αἱ ἐκκλησίαι πάσης τῆς χώρας ὑπόκειντα· ἕκαστος δὲ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἔχει τὰς ἰδίας κώμας, μεγίστας δὲ ἀριθμῷ δέκα που καὶ πλέονας.

[64] Apol. (p. 127.) Non unum cum presbyteris chorepiscopos fuisse, aut eandem formam gestasse, prout Decretalium suppositori somniare visum est.

[65] C. 14. (t. 1. p. 1484 c.) Οἱ δὲ χωρεπίσκοποί εἰσι μὲν εἰς τύπον τῶν ἑβδομήκοντα.

But it is said that they could not be bishops, because the ordination of bishops was to be performed by three bishops, with the consent of the metropolitan and the provincial bishops; whereas the Council of Antioch[66] says, 'that a *chorepiscopus* was ordained by one bishop only, the bishop of the city, to whose jurisdiction he belonged.' To this the reply is easy,—that this was one principal difference between the city-bishops and country-bishops, who differed both in the manner of their ordination and in their power; for the one was subordinate to the other. Therefore those canons, which require three bishops to impose hands in the ordination of a bishop, speak only of such bishops as were to be absolute and supreme governors of their own diocese, and not of such who were subordinate to them, whom the city-bishops might ordain at their own discretion, yet so as to stand accountable to a provincial synod.

6. The office of these *chorepiscopi* was to preside over the country-clergy, and inquire into their behaviour, and make report thereof to the city-bishop; as also to provide fit persons for the inferior service and ministry of the Church. And, to give them some authority, they had certain privileges conferred on them; as, first, they might ordain readers, sub-deacons, and exorcists, for the use of the country-churches. St. Basil[67] requires of his *chorepiscopi*, that they should first acquaint him with the qualification of such persons, and take his license to ordain them. But the Council of Antioch[68] gives them a general commission to ordain all under presbyters and deacons, without consulting the city-bishop upon every such promotion: and for presbyters and deacons, they might ordain them too, but not *δίχα τοῦ ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐπισκόπου*, *without the special*

[66] C. 10. (t. 2. p. 565 d.) Χωρεπίσκοπον δὲ γίνεσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ τῆς πόλεως, ᾗ ὑπόκειται, ἐπισκόπου.

[67] Ep. 181. [al. 54.] ad Chorepisc. (t. 3. part. 1. p. 211 c.) Καὶ τοῦτο ἐξήταζον μὲν πρεσβύτεροι καὶ διάκονοι οἱ συνοικοῦντες αὐτοῖς, ἐπανέφερον δὲ τοῖς χωρεπισκόποις, οἳ τὰς παρὰ τῶν ἀληθινῶς μαρτυρούντων δεξάμενοι ψήφους, καὶ ὑπομνήσαντες τὸν ἐπίσκοπον, οὕτως ἐνηρίθμουν τὸν ὑπηρέτην τῷ τάγματι τῶν ἱερατικῶν· νῦν δὲ πρῶτον μὲν ἡμᾶς παρωσάμενοι, καὶ, μηδὲ ἐπαναφέρειν ἡμῖν καταδεχόμενοι, εἰς ἑαυτοὺς τὴν ὅλην περιεστήσατε αὐθεντίαν· .. Μὴ ἀριθμεῖτε δὲ πρὶν εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐπανενεγκεῖν· ἢ γινώσκετε, ὅτι λαϊκὸς ἔσται ὁ ἄνευ ἡμετέρας γνώμης εἰς ὑπηρεσίαν παραδεχθείς.

[68] C. 10. (t. 2. p. 565 d.) Καθιστᾶν δὲ ἀναγνώστας, καὶ ὑποδιακόνους, καὶ ἐξορκιστὰς, καὶ τῇ τούτων ἀρκεῖσθαι προσαγωγῇ, μήτε πρεσβύτερον, μήτε διάκονον χειροτονεῖν τολμᾶν, δίχα τοῦ ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐπισκόπου, ᾗ ὑπόκεινται αὐτός τε καὶ ἡ χώρα.

leave of the city-bishop, under whose jurisdiction both they and the country were. And this is the meaning of the Council of Ancyra[69], which says, 'the *chorepiscopi* shall not have power to ordain presbyters or deacons:' which we must interpret by the explication given in the Council of Antioch, that they should not be authorized to do it without the particular direction of the city-bishop, but by his leave they might.

They powe confi

7. Secondly, they had power to minister confirmation to such as were newly baptized in country-churches. This is expressly provided by the Council of Riez[70], in the case of Armentarius, whom they reduced to the quality of a *chorepiscopus*, but still allowed him the privilege of confirming neophytes: which argues, that confirmation might then be administered by the hands of the *chorepiscopi* in country-churches.

And to gr letter missc the c

8. Thirdly, they had power to grant letters dimissory, or, as they were otherwise called, canonical and irenical letters, to the country-clergy, who desired to remove from one diocese to another. Thus I understand that canon of the Council of Antioch[71], which says, 'country-presbyters shall not grant *canonical letters*, *κανονικὰς ἐπιστολὰς*, or send letters to any neighbour bishop; but the *chorepiscopi* may grant *εἰρηνικὰς*, *letters dimissory*, or *letters of peace*.'

They powe officii the p sence the c bisho

9. Fourthly, they had liberty to officiate in the city-church, in the presence of the bishop and presbyters of the city, which country-presbyters had not; for so the Council of Neocæsarea determined in two canons to this purpose[72]: 'The country-presbyters shall not offer the oblation, nor distribute the bread and wine, in time of prayer, in the city-church, when the bishop and presbyters are present; but the country-bishops, being in

[69] C. 13. (t. 1. p. 1461 a.) Χωρεπισκόπους μὴ ἐξεῖναι πρεσβυτέρους ἢ διακόνους χειροτονεῖν.

[70] C. 3. (t. 3. p. 1287 b.) Nec usquam ipsi quidquam de episcopalibus officiis usurpare, præterquam in ecclesia, quam cujusquam misericordia fuerit indeptus: in qua ei solum neophytos confirmare et ante presbyteros offerre conceditur.

[71] C. 8. (t. 2. p. 564 e.) Μηδὲ πρεσβυτέρους τοὺς ἐν ταῖς χώραις κανονικὰς ἐπιστολὰς διδόναι, ἢ πρὸς μόνους τοὺς γείτονας ἐπισκόπους ἐπιστολὰς ἐκπέμπτειν· τοὺς δὲ ἀνεπιλήπτους χωρεπισκόπους διδόναι εἰρηνικάς.

[72] Cc. 13 et 14. (t. 1. p. 1484 b, c.) Ἐπιχώριοι πρεσβύτεροι ἐν τῷ κυριακῷ τῆς πόλεως προσφέρειν οὐ δύνανται, παρόντος ἐπισκόπου ἢ πρεσβυτέρων πόλεως, οὔτε μὴν ἄρτον διδόναι ἐν εὐχῇ οὐδὲ ποτήριον. . . . Οἱ δὲ χωρεπίσκοποί εἰσι μὲν εἰς τύπον τῶν ἑβδομήκοντα· ὡς δὲ συλλειτουργοὶ, διὰ τὴν σπουδὴν εἰς τοὺς πτωχοὺς, προσφέρουσι τιμώμενοι.

imitation of the seventy, as fellow-labourers, for their care of the poor, are admitted to offer.'

nd to sit
nd vote in
ouncil.

10. Fifthly, they had the privilege of sitting and voting in synods and councils; of which there are several instances still remaining in the Acts of the ancient Councils. In the first Nicene Council[73], Palladius and Seleucius subscribe themselves *chorepiscopi* of the province of Cœlosyria; Eudæmon, *chorepiscopus* of the province of Cilicia; Gorgonius, Stephanus, Euphronius, Rhodon, Theophanes, *chorepiscopi* of the province of Cappadocia; Hesychius, Theodore, Anatolius, Quintus, Aquila, *chorepiscopi* of the province of Isauria; Theustinus and Eulalius, of the province of Bithynia. So again, in the Council of Neocæsarea[74], Stephanus and Rudus, or Rhodon, two of the same that were in the Council of Nice, subscribed themselves *chorepiscopi* of the province of Cappadocia; and in the Council of Ephesus[75], Cæsarius, *chorepiscopus* of Alce.

he power
f the *chor-*
piscopi not
he same in
l times
nd places.

11. But here I must observe, that the power and privileges of the *chorepiscopi* varied much, according to the difference of times and places; for when the Synod of Riez in France, anno 439, had deposed Armentarius from his bishopric, because he was uncanonically ordained, they allowed him the privilege of being a *chorepiscopus*, after the example of the Nicene fathers, but limited him as to the exercise of his power. For though they gave him authority to confirm neophytes, and consecrate virgins, and celebrate the eucharist in any country-church, with preference to any presbyter of the region, yet, first, they denied him[76] the privilege of consecrating the eucharist in the city-church; which, by the thirteenth canon of the Council of Neocæsarea, was allowed to other *chorepiscopi*. Secondly, they confined him to a single church in the exercise of his *chorepiscopal* power; whereas others had power over a whole region. Thirdly, they forbad him to ordain any of the inferior clergy, even in his own church, which other *chorepiscopi* were allowed to do by the thirteenth canon of the Council of Ancyra: and hence it appears, that as their power was precarious, and depending

[73] In subscript. (t. 2. p. 51 e.)
[74] In subscript. (t. 1. p. 1488 d.)
[75] Act. 1. (t. 3. p. 539 c.)
[76] Vid. C. Reins. [al. Regens.] c. 3. (ibid. p. 1287 b.) Ne unquam in civitatibus, vel sub episcoporum absentia, offerre præsumat .... nec usquam ipsi, &c. See n. 70, preceding.

upon the will of councils and city-bishops, from whom they received it, so by this time their authority began to sink apace in the Church.

Their power first struck at by the Council of Laodicea, which set up περιοδευταὶ in their room.

12. The Council of Laodicea gave them the first blow, anno 360; for there it was decreed[77], 'that for the future no bishops should be placed in country villages, but only περιοδευταὶ, *itinerant* or *visiting presbyters;* and for such bishops as were already constituted, they should do nothing without the consent and direction of the city-bishop.' In the Council of Chalcedon we meet with some such presbyters expressly styled περιοδευταὶ, as Alexander[78] and Valentinus[79], each of which has the title of presbyter and περιοδευτής. And so, in the fifth general Council at Constantinople[80], one Sergius, a presbyter, has the same title of περιοδευτὴς, *curator* or *visitor* of the Syrian Churches. Yet still the order of the *chorepiscopi* was preserved in many places: for not only is mention made of them by Gregory Nazianzen[81] and St. Basil[82], in the fourth century, but also by Theodoret[83], who speaks of Hypatius and Abramius, his own *chorepiscopi.* And in the Council of Chalcedon, in the fifth century, we find the *chorepiscopi* sitting and subscribing in the name of the bishops that sent them: but this was some diminution of their power, for in former Councils they subscribed in their own names, as learned men[84] agree; but

[77] C. 57. (t. 1. p. 1505 e.) Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἐν ταῖς κώμαις καὶ ἐν ταῖς χώραις καθίστασθαι ἐπισκόπους, ἀλλὰ περιοδευτάς· τοὺς μὲν τοὶ ἤδη προκατασταθέντας μηδὲν πράττειν ἄνευ γνώμης τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τοῦ ἐν τῇ πόλει.

[78] Act. 4. (t. 4. p. 535 b.) Ὁ εὐλαβέστατος πρεσβύτερος καὶ περιοδευτὴς Ἀλέξανδρος.

[79] Act. 10. (ibid. p. 647 d.) Βαλέντιόν τινα ἐπίρρητον ἄνδρα ..... ἐχειροτόνησε πρεσβύτερον καὶ περιοδευτήν.

[80] C. Constant. sub Menna, act. 1. (t. 5. p. 37 c.) Σέργιος πρεσβύτερος, περιοδευτὴς, κ. τ. λ.

[81] Ep. 88. (t. 1. p. 843 d.) Παρὰ τῶν κυρίων μου τῶν συμπρεσβυτέρων μαθήσῃ Εὐλαλίου τοῦ χωρεπισκόπου καὶ Κελευσίου, οὓς ἐξ ἔργου πρὸς τὴν σὴν εὐλάβειαν ἀπεστάλκαμεν.

[82] Ep. 181. [al. 54.] ad Chorepisc. See n. 67, preceding.

[83] Ep. 113. ad Leon. (t. 4. part. 2. p. 1192.) Ταῦτα διὰ τῶν εὐλαβεστάτων καὶ θεοφιλεστάτων πρεσβυτέρων Ὑπατίου καὶ Ἀβραμίου τῶν χωρεπισκόπων, καὶ Ἀλυπίου τοῦ ἐξάρχου τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν μοναζόντων τὴν ὑμετέραν ἁγιωσύνην ἐδίδαξα.

[84] Blondel. Apol. s. 3. (p. 130.) .... Potuerunt enim sub jure ac nomine in Conciliis non modo topicis, sed etiam universalibus, cum episcopis sedere ac suffragium ferre. Hinc in Neocæsariensi octodecim capitum Synodo Stephanus et Rhudus, sive Rhodon, *Cappadociæ chorepiscopi,* 8 et 16 loco sederunt, &c.—Bevereg. in C. Ancyr. c. 13. (t. 2. append. p. 176.) Et quidem hujusmodi chorepiscopos plurimos antiquitus constitutos fuisse, ex Actis Conciliorum patet, utpote quibus ipsi, æque ac alii episcopi, non interfuerunt modo, sed et subscripserunt. Exempli gra-

now their power was sinking, and it went on to decay and dwindle by degrees, till at last, in the ninth century, when the forged Decretals were set on foot, it was pretended that they were not true bishops, and so the order, by the Pope's tyranny, came to be laid aside in the Western Church.

13. Some attempt was made in England, at the beginning of the Reformation, to restore these under the name of *suffragan bishops*; for, as our histories inform us[85], by an Act of the 26th of Henry the VIIIth, anno 1534, several towns were appointed for suffragan sees, viz. Thetford, Ipswich, Colchester, Dover, Guildford, Southampton, Taunton, Shaftesbury, Molton, Marlborough, Bedford, Leicester, Gloucester, Shrewsbury, Bristol, Penreth, Bridgewater, Nottingham, Grantham, Hull, Huntingdon, Cambridge, Pereth, Berwick, St. Germains in Cornwall, and the Isle of Wight. These suffragans were to be consecrated by the archbishop and two other bishops, and by the Act to have the same episcopal power as suffragans formerly had within this realm: but none of them were either to have or act anything properly episcopal, without the consent and permission of the bishop of the city, in whose diocese he was placed and constituted. Now any one, that compares this with the account that I have given of the ancient *chorepiscopi*, will easily perceive that these suffragans were much of the same nature with them; but then I must observe that this was a new name for them.

14. For anciently suffragan bishops were all the city-bishops of any province under a metropolitan, who were called his *suffragans*, because they met at his command to give their suffrage, counsel, or advice in a provincial synod; and in this sense the word was used in England at the time when Linwood

tia, Synodo Nicænæ primæ subscripserunt ex provincia Cœlesyriæ Palladius chorepiscopus et Seleucius chorepiscopus. . . . . Et sic in aliis Conciliis chorepiscopi ipsos inter episcopos subscripserunt, idque non ut aliorum episcoporum locum tenentes, sed pro seipsis. Qui enim aliorum vices gerunt, illud in subscriptionibus significare solent, quod a chorepiscopis nuspiam fit.

[85] Burnet, History of the Reformation, b. 2. (v. 1. p. 157.) By the fourteenth act provision was made for suffragan bishops, &c.—Ibid. (p. 158.) These were believed to be the same with the *chorepiscopi* in the primitive church, which as they were begun before the first Council of Nice, so they continued in the Western Church till the ninth century, and then a Decretal of Damasus being forged, that condemned them, they were put down everywhere by degrees, and now revived in England.

wrote his Provinciale; which was not above an hundred years before the Reformation, anno 1430. In his comment upon one of the Constitutions of John Peckham, archbishop of Canterbury, which begins with these words, *Omnibus et singulis coepiscopis, suffraganeis nostris, To all and singular our fellow-bishops and suffragans;* he has this note[86] upon this word *suffragans:* 'They were called *suffragans*, because they were bound to give their suffrage and assistance to the archbishop, being summoned to take part in his care, though not in the plenitude of his power.' Whence it is plain, that in his time suffragan bishops did not signify *chorepiscopi*, or *rural bishops*, but all the bishops of England under their archbishops or metropolitans. Thus it was also in other Churches. The seventy bishops, who were immediately subject to the bishop of Rome, as their primate or metropolitan, were called his suffragans, because they were frequently called to his synods: as the reason of the name is given in an ancient Vatican MS. cited by Baronius[87].

The s gan b of the Roma provi called techn name

15. And here it will not be amiss to observe, whilst we are speaking of suffragan bishops, that these seventy bishops, who were suffragans to the bishop of Rome, were by a peculiar technical name called *libra;* which name was given them for no other reason, but because of their number *seventy*. For the Roman *libra*, as antiquaries[88] note, consisted of seventy *solidi*, or so many parts; and therefore the number seventy, in any other things or persons, thence took the name of *libra:* as the seventy witnesses, which are introduced deposing against Marcellinus, in the Council of Sinuessa, that they saw him sacrifice, are by the author of those Acts[89] termed *libra occidua;* for no other reason, as Baronius[90] conceives, but because they

[86] Provincial. l. 1. tit. 2. c. 1. (p. 11. n. g.) Suffraganeis. Sic dictis, quia archiepiscopo suffragari et assistere tenentur, &c.

[87] An. 1057. n. 18. (t. 11. p. 239 b.) Præter septem collaterales episcopos erant alii episcopi, qui dicuntur suffraganei Romani Pontificis, nulli alii primati vel archiepiscopo subjecti, qui frequenter ad synodos vocarentur.

[88] Brerewood, de Ponder. et Pret. c. 15. (ap. Walton. Prolegom. p. 34.)... Ita ut 72 [aurei nummi] ex auri libra cuderentur.

[89] Ap. Crabb. t. 1. p. 190. (ap. Labb. t. 1. p. 939 e.) Hi omnes electi sunt viri, Libra Occidua, qui testimonium perhibent, videntes [al. se vidisse eumdem] Marcellinum thurificasse.

[90] An. 302. n. 92. (t. 2. p. 724 d.) Quod.. inferius acta Synodi in causa Marcellini numerum septuaginta duorum testium, Libram Occiduam, nominant: inde patet, quod hic dicitur; omnes electi sunt viri Libra Occidua, qui testimonium perhi-

were seventy in number. And Grotius[91] gives the same reason for affixing this title on the seventy bishops, who were assessors or suffragans to the bishop of Rome; they were, as one might say, his *libra*, or ordinary provincial council.

CHAP. XV.

Of the intercessores and interventores in the African Churches.

Why some bishops called *intercessors* in the African Churches.

1. THERE is one appellation more given to some bishops in the African Councils, which must here be taken notice of, whilst we are speaking of bishops, which is the name *intercessor* and *interventor;* a title given to some bishops upon the account of a *pro-tempore* office, which was sometimes committed to them. In the African Churches, and perhaps in others also, upon the vacancy of a bishopric, it was usual for the primate to appoint one of the provincial bishops to be a sort of procurator of the diocese; partly to take care of the vacant see, and partly to promote and procure the speedy election of a new bishop: and from this he had the name of *intercessor* and *interventor.*

The office of an intercessor not to last above a year.

2. The design of this office was manifestly to promote the good of the Church, but it was liable to be abused two ways: for the *intercessor*, by this means, had a fair opportunity given to ingratiate himself with the people, and promote his own interest among them, instead of that of the Church; either by keeping the see void longer than was necessary, or, if it was a wealthier or more honourable place than his own, by getting himself chosen into it. To obviate any such designs, the African fathers, in the fifth Council of Carthage, made a decree, that no intercessor should continue in his office for above a year; but if he did not procure a new bishop to be chosen within that time, another intercessor should be sent in his room.

No intercessor to be made bi-

3. And the more effectually to cut off all abuses, and prevent corruption, they enacted it also into a law[92], that no inter-

bent. Numerum septuaginta duorum testium esse significatum, eumque esse dictum Libram Occiduam, quod scilicet ea libra septuaginta duos solidos contineret; ut ea lege declaratur, qua dicitur, Quotiescunque certa summa solidorum pro tituli qualitate debetur, aut auri massa transmittitur, in septuaginta duos solidos libra feratur accepta.

[91] In Luc. 10, 1. (t. 2. v. 1. p. 396. 5.) .... Romanis episcopis jam olim septuaginta episcopi adsessores *libra* dicti, quod libra Romana tot solidos contineret.

[92] C. Carth. v. c. 8. (t. 2. p. 1216 e.)

cessor should be capable of succeeding himself in the vacant see, whatever motions or solicitations were made by the people in his behalf. So extremely cautious were these holy African fathers to prevent abuses in matters of this nature.

shop of place w he was constitu interces

CHAP. XVI.

Of primates or metropolitans.

1. The same reasons, which first brought in *chorepiscopi* and coadjutors, as subordinate to bishops in every city-church, made the bishops of every province think it necessary to make one of themselves superior to all the rest, and invest him with certain powers and privileges for the good of the whole; whom they therefore named their *primate* or *metropolitan*, that is, the principal bishop of the province. Bishop Usher[93] derives the origin of this settlement from apostolical constitution; so also bishop Beveridge[94], Dr. Hammond[95], Peter de Marca, and some others; and there are several passages in Eusebius and Chrysostom which seem to favour this. For Eusebius[96] says, 'Titus had the superintendency of all the

Some d rive the ginal of tropolit from a stolical stitutio

Ut nulli intercessori licitum sit, cathedram, cui intercessor datus est, quibuslibet populorum studiis, vel seditionibus retinere: sed dare operam, ut intra annum eisdem episcopum provideat. Quod si neglexerit, anno expleto [al. exempto], interventor alius tribuatur.

[93] De Orig. Episc. et Metropol. (Works, v. 7. pp. 43, seqq.) See p. 45. But nothing being so familiar now-a-days, &c.

[94] Cod. Canon. Vindic. l. 2. c. 5. n. 12. (ap. Cotel. t. 2. p. 96.) Cum apostoli itaque, cœlitus evocati et adjuti, ecclesiæ, a Christo fundatæ, per universum terrarum orbem propagandæ operam navarent, imperium Romanum, ubi religio Christiana multo citius faciliusque quam apud rudiores gentes suscepta est, ita dispositum invenientes, omnes ejusdem provincias singillatim peragrabant; et ubicumque aliquos ad fidem Christianam converterant, ecclesiam ibidem instituebant, ab ista provincia denominatam in qua constituta est, vel a primaria aliqua ejusdem civitate. Hierosolymis, quæ istis diebus nondum deleta, provinciæ Palæstinæ metropolis erat et Judææ caput, ecclesia prima fundata est, quæ propterea *Ecclesia Hierosolymitana* dicitur, Ἡ ἐκκλησία ἡ ἐν τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις, Act. 8, 1. 11, 22. Sic etiam ecclesia in Antiochia, Syriæ metropoli, memoratur, Act. 13, 1. Et alia in Corintho, metropoli Achaiæ, 1 Cor. 1, 1. 2 Cor. 1, 1. Ad hæc D. Paulum Syriam et Ciliciam peragrasse legimus, ecclesias confirmantem, Act. 15, 41: necnon Galatiam et Phrygiam, c. 18, 23. Syria, Cilicia, Galatia, et Phrygia, quatuor erant provinciæ imperio Romano subditæ.

[95] Pref. to Titus, (v. 3. p. 715.) .... Ordained by him [St. Paul] archbishop of the island of Crete, &c.—It. Dissert. 4. cont. Blondel. c. 5. (v. 4. pp. 797, seqq.) Secundo igitur, &c.

[96] L. 3. c. 4. (v. 1. p. 91. 15.) Τιμόθεός γε μὴν τῆς ἐν Ἐφέσῳ παροικίας ἱστορεῖται πρῶτος τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν εἰληχέναι· ὡς καὶ Τίτος τῶν ἐπὶ Κρήτης ἐκκλησιῶν.

Churches in Crete;' and Chrysostom[97] in like manner, 'that the Apostle committed to him the whole island, and gave him power to censure all the bishops therein.' He says the same of Timothy[98], 'that he was entrusted with the government of the Church in the whole region or province of Asia.' And it is certain, the Cyprian bishops in the Council of Ephesus[99] pleaded the privileges of their metropolitan to be as ancient as the Apostles.

therefrom e age next ter the postles.

2. But it may be doubted whether the Apostles made any such general settlement of metropolitans in every province, and the records of the original of most Churches being lost, it cannot be certainly proved they did. De Marca[1] thinks, that though the Apostles gave a model or specimen in Timothy and Titus, yet they left it to following ages to finish and complete it. Dr. Cave[2] says, 'it commenced not long after the apostolic age, when sects and schisms began to break in apace; and .... controversies multiplying between particular bishops, it was found necessary to pitch upon one in every province, to whom the umpirage of cases might be referred, and by whom all common and public affairs might be directed.' Perhaps it took its rise from that common respect and deference which was usually paid by the rest of the bishops to the bishop of the civil metropolis in every province; which,

[97] Hom. 1 in Tit. (t. 11. p. 719 b.) .... Οὐκ ἂν αὐτῷ τὴν νῆσον ὁλόκληρον ἐπέτρεψεν .... οὐκ ἂν τοσούτων ἐπισκόπων κρίσιν ἐπέτρεψεν.

[98] Hom. 15. in 1 Tim. c. 5. (t. 11. p. 637 c.) .... Δῆλον δέ ἐστιν ἐντεῦθεν, ὅτι ἐκκλησίαν λοιπὸν ἦν ἐμπεπιστευμένος ὁ Τιμόθεος, ἡ καὶ ἔθνος ὁλόκληρον τὸ τῆς Ἀσίας.

[99] Act. 7. (t. 3. p. 800 e.) Sancta Synodus dixit; .... Docete .... an non jus ordinandi ex more veteri apud vos habet Antiochenus? Zenon episcopus dixit; Prius affirmavimus, quod nunquam vel adfuerit vel ordinaverit; neque in metropoli neque in alia civitate; sed Synodus nostræ provinciæ congregata constituebat metropolitanum: et oramus, ut vestra sancta Synodus sua sententia nobis consentiat ..... et nullam novitatem in nostra provincia fieri sinat.

[1] De Concord. l. 6. c. 1. n. 9. (p. 778.) Enimvero licet, ut ego quidem existimo, formam distribuendarum provinciarum, et metropolitanorum instituendorum, apostoli tradiderint; quia tamen id nuspiam [al. nullibi] in sacris Scripturis præceptum est, et præterea executio et singularis institutio processu dein temporis facta est episcoporum cura, qui ecclesiis apostolicis præsidebant fundatis ab apostolicis [al. apostolis,] duo quædam notatu valde digna contigere. Primum enim inde factum est, ut veteres hanc provinciarum divisionem, non ipsis apostolis, sed patribus et vetustæ consuetudini, tribuerint.

[2] Cave, Ancient Church Government, p. 92. (ch. 2. p. 391.) To me it seems probable that it actually commenced, &c.

advancing into a custom, was afterwards made into a canon by the Council of Nice.

3. This is certain, that the Nicene Council speaks of metropolitans as settled by ancient custom long before, when it ushers in the canon about them with[3] ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω, *let ancient customs be continued;* and then goes on to speak of the custom in Egypt, which was for the bishop of Alexandria to have power over all the Churches of Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis; which was metropolitical, if not patriarchal, power. Epiphanius[4] mentions the same, speaking of Alexander and Peter, bishops of Alexandria, before the Council of Nice, he says, 'they had ἐκκλησιαστικὴν διοίκησιν, *the administration of ecclesiastical affairs,* throughout all Egypt, Thebais, Mareotes, Libya, Ammoniaca, Mareotis, and Pentapolis.' And Athanasius[5], speaking of Dionysius, who was bishop of Alexandria above sixty years before this Council, says, 'he also enjoyed this power, having the care of the Churches of Pentapolis and Libya, when Sabellius broached his heresy; and that he wrote letters of admonition to several bishops of those parts, who began to be infected with his heresy.' These are undeniable evidences that the bishops of Alexandria were not first invested with metropolitical power by the Council of Nice, but only confirmed in those rights, which by ancient custom and prescription they had long enjoyed. And this was also the case of other Churches.

Conf by all have long the C of Ni

The Council of Eliberis in Spain[6] speaks of a *primæ cathedræ episcopus, a primate* or *bishop of the first see;* and those called the Apostles' Canons, which were the Canons of the Greek Church in the third century, mention a πρῶτος, or *chief bishop,* in every province, whom the rest were to look

[3] C. 6. (t. 2. p. 32 c.) Τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω, τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ Λιβύῃ καὶ Πενταπόλει, ὥστε τὸν Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπίσκοπον πάντων τούτων ἔχειν τὴν ἐξουσίαν.

[4] Hær. 68. Melet. n. 1. (t. 1. p. 717 b.) Τοῦτο γὰρ ἔθος ἐστὶ, τὸν ἐν τῇ Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ἀρχιεπίσκοπον πάσης τε Αἰγύπτου καὶ Θηβαΐδος, Μαραιώτου τε, καὶ Λιβύης, Ἀμμωνιακῆς, Μαραιωτιδός τε καὶ Πενταπόλεως, ἔχειν τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν διοίκησιν. —Cf. Hær. 69. n. 3. (ibid. p. 729 b.)

[5] De Sentent. Dionys. p. 552. (t. 1. part. 1. p. 194 a. n. 5.) Ἐν Πενταπόλει τῆς ἄνω Λιβύης τηνικαῦτά τινες τῶν ἐπισκόπων ἐφρόνησαν τὰ Σαβελλίου .... τοῦτο μαθὼν Διονύσιος, αὐτὸς γὰρ εἶχε τὴν μέριμναν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἐκείνων, κ. τ. λ.

[6] Anno 305. c. 58. (t. 1. p. 976 e.) Placuit, ubique et maxime in eo loco, in quo prima cathedra constituta est episcopatus, &c.

upon as their head[7], and do nothing without him. And it appears from several of Cyprian's Epistles[8], that the bishop of Carthage had a presidency over all the other African bishops, and power to send his mandates among them. And St. Austin speaks of the primate of Numidia, as well as the primate of Carthage, before the schism of the Donatists; and says they gave that for one reason of their schism[9], 'that the primate of Numidia was not called to elect and consecrate the primate of Carthage.' And therefore, as both the same St. Austin[10] and Optatus[11] take notice, the Donatists pretending that the ordination of Cæcilian, bishop of Carthage, was not valid, because not performed by a primate, sent for Secundus Tigisitanus, who was then primate of Numidia, to ordain Majorinus in his room. Now, as all this was transacted several years before the Council of Nice, so it proves that primates were in Afric antecedent to the establishment of that Council.

4. If we ascend higher yet, and look into the second century, there are some footsteps of the same power, though not so evident as the former. Lyons in France was a metropolis in the civil

[7] C. 33. Cotel. [c. 27.] (v. 1. p. 442.) *Τοὺς ἐπισκόπους ἑκάστου ἔθνους εἰδέναι χρὴ τὸν ἐν αὐτοῖς πρῶτον, καὶ ἡγεῖσθαι αὐτὸν ὡς κεφαλὴν, καὶ μηδὲν πράττειν περιττὸν ἄνευ τῆς ἐκείνου γνώμης.*

[8] Ep. 42. [al. 45.] ad Cornel. (p. 231.) .. Per provinciam nostram hæc eadem collegis singulis in notitiam perferentes, ab his quoque fratres nostros cum literis dirigendos esse mandavimus.—See also Ep. 40. [al. 43.] ad Pleb. Carth. (p. 227.) .. Tamen ego quantum possum admoneo et quo modo possum visito vos literis meis, &c.—Ep. 45. [al. 48.] ad Cornel. (p. 234.) Sed quoniam latius fusa est nostra provincia, habet enim Numidiam et Mauritanias duas .... placuit ut per episcopos .... per omnes istic positos literæ fierent, &c.

[9] Brevic. Collat. die 3. c. 16. (t. 9. p. 570 f, g.) Deinde Donatistæ longa prosecutione agebant, ut ex illius auctoritate Carthaginiensis Concilii confirmaretur Cæciliani damnatio, quod ad tot sacerdotes venire noluerit; quasi non et Primianus ad eos, a quibus damnatus est, cum eorum factionem cognosceret, simili voluntate non venerit: et quod non expectaverit Cæcilianus, ut princeps a principe ordinaretur: cum aliud habeat ecclesiæ catholicæ consuetudo, ut non Numidiæ, sed propinquiores episcopi episcopum ecclesiæ Carthaginis ordinent: sicut nec Romanæ ecclesiæ ordinat aliquis episcopus metropolitanus, sed de proximo Ostiensis episcopus.

[10] Cont. Parmen. l. 1. c. 3. (ibid. p. 14 d, e.) Qui venientes cum primate suo tunc Secundo Tigisitano ...absentem Cæcilianum...traditorem esse censuerunt ... Ita contra sedentem in cathedra ... episcopum alterum ordinaverunt.

[11] L. 1. p. 41. (pp. 19, 20.) Suffragio totius populi Cæcilianus eligitur: et, manus imponente Felice Aptungitano, episcopus ordinatur... Ab iis tribus personis contra Cæcilianum causæ confictæ sunt, ut vitiosa ejus ordinatio diceretur. Ad Secundum Tigisitanum missum est ut Carthaginem veniretur, &c.

account, and Irenæus, who was bishop of it, is said to have the superintendency of the Gallican *paræciæ*, or *dioceses*, as Eusebius[12] words it. Philip, bishop of Gortyna in Crete, is styled by Dionysius[13] of Corinth, bishop of all the Cretian Churches. Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, presided[14] in council over all the bishops of Asia; Palmas, bishop of Amastris, over the bishops of Pontus; and Theophilus[15] of Cæsarea, with Narcissus of Jerusalem, over the rest of the bishops of Palestine.

These are the common proofs which are ordinarily alleged in this case; yet I shall freely own that the three last of them do not cogently prove the thing in dispute. For presiding in council does not necessarily infer metropolitical power; because they might preside as senior bishops; as Eusebius says expressly one of them did, viz. Palmas, bishop of Amastris, ὡς ἀρχαιότατος προὐτέτακτο, *he presided as the most ancient bishop among them.* Which seems to be noted by Eusebius, not without good reason: for Heraclea, and not Amastris, was the civil metropolis of Pontus. Blondel[16] from this passage concludes that at this time the senior bishops in all places were the metropolitans. But this does not sufficiently appear to have been the custom any where else but in the African Churches, of which I shall presently give an account; for the other instances that have been given seem rather to make it evident that the bishops of the civil metropoles were generally the primates or metropolitans in the Church also.

[12] L. 5. c. 23. (v. 1. p. 243. 2.) Τῶν τε κατὰ Πόντον ἐπισκόπων, ὧν Πάλμας ὡς ἀρχαιότατος προὐτέτακτο, καὶ τῶν κατὰ Γαλλίαν παροικιῶν, ἃς Εἰρηναῖος ἐπισκόπει.

[13] Ep. ap. Euseb. l. 4. c. 23. (ibid. p. 185. 20.) Καὶ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ δὲ τῇ παροικούσῃ Γόρτυναν, ἅμα ταῖς λοιπαῖς κατὰ Κρήτην παροικίαις, ἐπιστείλας, Φίλιππον ἐπίσκοπον αὐτῶν ἀποδέχεται, κ. τ. λ.

[14] Vid. Euseb. l. 5. c. 24. (ibid. p. 243. 12.) Τῶν δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀσίας ἐπισκόπων τὸ πάλαι πρότερον αὐτοῖς παραδοθὲν διαφυλάττειν ἔθος χρῆναι διισχυριζομένων, ἡγεῖτο Πολυκράτης· κ. τ. λ.

[15] Ibid. c. 23. (p. 242. 17.) Φέρεται εἰσέτι νῦν τῶν κατὰ Παλαιστίνην τηνικάδε συγκεκροτημένων γραφή, ὧν προὐτέτακτο Θεόφιλος τῆς ἐν Καισαρείᾳ παροικίας ἐπίσκοπος, καὶ Νάρκισσος τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις. . .Τῶν τε κατὰ Πόντον, κ. τ. λ. See n. 12, preceding.

[16] [Observanda in s. 2. de Episc. et Presbyt. n. 14. (pp. 54, 55.) Ad nonum usque sæculum expressa veteris moris vestigia in ecclesiis intueri licuit. Nam 1. Quod singuli ecclesiarum præpositi *papæ* ex æquo dicti sunt, ad promotione priores, qui sequentium omnium *ætate parentes* erant, jure antiquo *presbyteriorum* προστασίαν spectasse palam demonstrat. . . . . 3. Quod Ponticorum, anno 189 contractæ, Synodo Palmas, Amastridis Paphlagonum præpositus, ὡς ἀρχαιότατος προὐτέτακτο. *Euseb. l.* 5. *c.* 23. Ed.]

5. It is true indeed none of these are expressly called metropolitans: for that name scarcely occurs in any ancient record before the Council of Nice; but they were at first termed πρῶτοι and κεφαλαὶ, *chief bishops* and *heads of the province*, as the Apostolical Canon[17] styles them. After-ages gave them other names, as that of archbishops, at Alexandria[18] and other places, till that name became appropriate to the patriarchs. The Council of Sardica[19] styles them ἔξαρχοι τῆς ἐπαρχίας, *exarchs of the province*. St. Austin[20] sometimes calls them *principes*, *princes*; and Pope Hilary[21], *monarchs*. But these being titles of grandeur, and savouring too much of absolute sovereignty and dominion, were expressly prohibited by the third Council of Carthage, which ordered[22] 'that no superior bishop should be called high-priest, or prince of the priests, but only *primæ sedis episcopus*, *primate*, or *senior bishop*.' Hence it was that those bishops, who, in other parts of the world, were called metropolitans, in Afric had commonly the name of *primates*; though we sometimes meet with the name metropolitan in the African Councils also[23].

6. But these primates in Afric are frequently called *patres* and *senes*. As in the African Code, Xantippus primate of Numidia is once and again[24] styled *Senex Xantippus*; and St. Austin

[17] C. 33. See n. 7, preceding.

[18] Vid. Epiph. Hær. 68. Melet. n. 1. (t. 1. p. 717 b.) Καὶ ὁ μὲν Μελήτιος ἐν τῷ δεσμωτηρίῳ καθειργμένος ἦν, αὐτός τε καὶ οἱ προειρημένοι μάρτυρες, ἅμα τῷ προειρημένῳ Πέτρῳ, τῷ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ.— Hær. 69. Arian. n. 1. (t. 1. p. 727 c.) Ὅσαι γὰρ ἐκκλησίαι τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ὑπὸ ἕνα ἀρχιεπίσκοπον οὖσαι, κ. τ. λ.

[19] C. 6. (t. 2. p. 632 b.) Χρὴ πρότερον ἐκεῖνον τὸν ἐναπομείναντα ἐπίσκοπον ὑπομιμνήσκεσθαι διὰ γραμμάτων τοῦ ἐξάρχου τῆς ἐπαρχίας, λέγω δὴ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τῆς μητροπόλεως, ὅτι ἀξιοῖ τὰ πλήθη ποιμένα αὐτοῖς δοθῆναι· ἡγοῦμαι καλῶς ἔχειν καὶ τοῦτον ἐκδέχεσθαι, ἵνα παραγένηται.

[20] Brevic. Collat. die 3. c. 16. (t. 9. p. 570 g.) Non expectavit Cæcilianus, ut princeps a principe ordinaretur.

[21] Ep. ad Leont. Arelat. ap. Baron. an. 462. (t. 6. p. 263 e.) Miramur fraternitatem tuam ita legis catholicæ immemorem esse, ut quæque iniqua et contra patrum nostrorum statuta in provincia, quæ ad monarchiam tuam pertinet, si ipse aut non vis, aut non potes, etiam nec nos silentii tui taciturnitate permittas corrigere.

[22] C. 26. (t. 2. p. 1171 b.) Ut primæ sedis episcopus non appelletur princeps sacerdotum, aut summus sacerdos, aut aliquid hujusmodi; sed tantum prima sedis episcopus.

[23] Vid. C. Carth. 4. c. 1. (t. 2. p. 1199 c.) Cum in his omnibus examinatus, inventus fuerit plene instructus, tunc cum consensu clericorum et laicorum, et conventu totius provinciæ episcoporum, maximeque metropolitani vel auctoritate vel præsentia, ordinetur episcopus.

[24] Cc. 91 et 101. [al. 90 et 100.]

writing to him, inscribes his Epistle[25] *Patri et Consacerdoti Seni Xantippo;* and thus, in many other Epistles[26], writing to the primates, or speaking of them, he gives them the names of *senes.* And there was a peculiar reason for giving them this name in Afric: for here the primacy was not fixed, as in other places, to the civil metropolis, but always went along with the oldest bishop of the province, who succeeded to this dignity by virtue of his seniority, whatever place he lived in. In other parts of the world the bishop of the civil metropolis was commonly metropolitan in the Church also; and so it was ordered to be by several canons, both of the Eastern and Western Churches. The Council of Antioch[27] bids all bishops observe that 'the bishop of the metropolis has the care of the whole province, because all men that have business or controversies to be decided resort from all parts to the metropolis.' And the Council of Turin[28], upon this foot, determined a dispute about primacy betwixt the two bishops of Arles and Vienna, decreeing, 'that he that could prove his city to be the metropolis should be the primate of the whole province.' The Council of Chalcedon has two canons[29], appointing those cities to be metropoles in the Church, which were so in the civil division of the Empire: and the Council of Trullo has one[30] to the same purpose.

oldes shop alwa trop

(t. 2. p. 1106 a. et p. 1118 a.) Τῷ ἁγιωτάτῳ Γέροντι Ξαγκτίππῳ—Πρὸς αὐτὸν τὸν Γέροντα Ξάγκτιππον.—

[25] Ep. 236. [al. 65.] (t. 2. p. 154 a.)

[26] Ep. 149. [al. 38.] (t. 2. p. 82 g.) Quod Senex Megalius defunctus sit, &c.—Ep. c. 152. [al. 141.] (t. 2. p. 456 d.) Silvanus Senex, &c.—Ep. 235. [al. 64.] (t. 2. p. 152 g. et p. 153.) Apud venerabilem . . . fratrem et collegam meum Senem Aurelium, &c.—Ep. 261. [al. 209.] (t. 2. p. 777 f.) Sanctum Senem, qui tunc primatum Numidiæ gerebat, de longinquo ut veniret rogans, &c.

[27] C. 9. (t. 2. p. 565 a.) Τοὺς καθ' ἑκάστην ἐπαρχίαν ἐπισκόπους εἰδέναι χρὴ τὸν ἐν τῇ μητροπόλει προεστῶτα ἐπίσκοπον καὶ τὴν φροντίδα ἀναδέχεσθαι πάσης τῆς ἐπαρχίας, διὰ τὸ ἐν τῇ μητροπόλει πανταχόθεν συντρέχειν πάντας τοὺς πράγματα ἔχοντας.

[28] C. 2. (ibid. p. 1156 b.) . . . Qui ex eis approbaverit suam civitatem esse metropolim, is totius provinciæ honorem primatus obtineat.

[29] C. 12. (t. 4. p. 762 c.) Ὅσαι δὲ ἤδη πόλεις διὰ γραμμάτων βασιλικῶν τῷ τῆς μητροπόλεως ἐτιμήθησαν ὀνόματι, μόνης ἀπολαυέτωσαν τῆς τιμῆς, καὶ ὁ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν αὐτῆς διοικῶν ἐπίσκοπος, δηλονότι σωζομένων τῇ κατὰ ἀλήθειαν μητροπόλει τῶν οἰκείων δικαίων.—C. 17. (ibid. 763 c.) Εἴ δέ τις ἐκ βασιλικῆς ἐξουσίας ἐκαινίσθη πόλις, ἢ αὖθις καινισθείη, τοῖς πολιτικοῖς καὶ δημοσίοις τύποις καὶ τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν παροικιῶν ἡ τάξις ἀκολουθείτω.

[30] C. 36. (t. 6. p. 1159 d.) Τὸν ἐκ τῶν πατέρων τεθέντα κανόνα καὶ ἡμεῖς παραφυλάττομεν, τὸν οὕτω διαγορεύοντα· Εἴ τις ἐκ βασιλικῆς ἐξουσίας, κ. τ. λ.

But in the African Churches it was otherwise, for they were governed by rules and canons of their own; and their rule was, to let the primacy remove from city to city, and still go along with the senior bishop, without any regard to the civil metropolis: except only at Carthage, where the bishop was a fixed and standing metropolitan for the province of Africa, properly so called. But in Numidia and Mauritania this honour was moveable, as may appear from this one instance. Constantina was the civil metropolis of Numidia, as we learn both from the ancient Notitia of the Empire and one of the canons[31] of the African Code, which expressly styles it so; yet the primacy was so far from being settled here, that we never so much as find that the bishop of Constantina was at any time the primate: but in Constantine's time, Secundus Tigisitanus[32] was primate of Numidia: in St. Austin's time, Megalius, bishop of Calama, was primate, who, by virtue of his office[33], ordained St. Austin bishop: afterwards Xantippus of Tagasta[34] succeeded by virtue of his seniority, whence he is always styled in St. Austin[35] and the African Councils[36] *Senex Xantippus.* This is sufficient to shew that the primacy in Afric was not confined to the civil metropolis, but was always conferred upon the senior bishop, whose seniority was reckoned from the time of his consecration. Some there are who pretend to say, that these African primates, notwithstanding this, were subject to the bishops of the civil metropoles, who were properly the

[31] C. 86. (t. 2. p. 2002 c.). "Ἤρεσε πᾶσι τοῖς ἐπισκόποις, τοῖς ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ συνόδῳ ἐπιγράψασιν, ἵνα τὸ ματρίκιον καὶ ἀρχέτυπον τῆς Νουμιδίας, καὶ εἰς τὴν πρώτην καθέδραν ᾖ, καὶ εἰς τὴν μητρόπολιν Κωνσταντίναν.

[32] Vid. August. cont. Parmen. l. 1. c. 3. (t. 9. p. 14 c.) Qui venientes cum primate suo tunc Secundo Tigisitano, &c.—Ep. 68. [al. 88.] ad Januar. (t. 2. p. 214 e.) Illud tamen nullo modo prætermittendum est, quomodo Felicis Aptungensis, quem fontem omnium malorum in Concilio Carthaginensi, ab Secundo Tigisitano primate, patres vestri fuisse dixerunt, urgentibus apud Imperatorem vestris, publico judicio causa discussa atque finita sit.

[33] Possid. Vit. August. c. 8. (t. 10. append. p. 262 e.) ..... Adveniente ad ecclesiam Hipponensem tunc primate Numidiæ Megalio, Calamensi episcopo, &c.

[34] C. Milev. 1. in Cod. Afric. c. 84. [al. 85.] (t. 2. p. 1099 d.) Ξάγκτιππος τῆς πρώτης καθέδρας τῆς Νουμίδιας.—Conf. August. Ep. 217. [al. 59.] (t. 2. p. 147 a.) Collega noster Xantippus Tagatensis dicit, quod cum primatus ipse contingat, &c.—[Xantippus Tagosensis is the reading of the Edit. Bened. See the note at the foot of page 147. Ed.]

[35] Ep. 236. [al. 65.] (t. 2. p. 153 g.) Domino beatissimo et venerabiliter suscipiendo Patri et Consacerdoti Seni Xantippo in Domino salutem.

[36] See n. 24, preceding.

metropolitans. But there is no ground for this opinion, and it is justly exploded by De Marca[37] and others[38], who have occasionally touched upon this subject.

7. It is true, indeed, by the African discipline *a bishop might lose his primogeniture*, and so forfeit his title to the primacy: as is evident from a passage in St. Austin[39], which speaks of such a punishment inflicted upon one Priscus, a Mauritanian bishop, who for some misdemeanour was denied this privilege, though he still kept his bishopric. But in such cases the primacy did not devolve to the bishop of the civil metropolis, but to the next in order, who could prove himself senior by consecration.

8. And because disputes sometimes arose about *seniority*, to prevent these, several good orders were made by the African fathers relating to this matter. As, first, that a *matricula* or *archivus*, as they called it, should be kept both in the primate's church[40], and in the metropolis of the province, for bishops to prove the time of their ordination by.

Then, secondly, every bishop was to have his letters of ordination subscribed by his ordainers, and dated with the year

[37] Dissert. de Primatibus, n. 3. (ad calc. Oper. p. 11.) Itaque licet e sex provinciis, ex quibus Africana diœcesis constabat, duæ Mauritaniæ, Numidiæ, Byzacena, et Tripolitana, sua quæque metropoli in ordine imperii non carerent, prima tamen sedes ecclesiastica non erat illi addicta, sed episcopum seniorem sequebatur .... Solius Carthaginis splendor id obtinuerat, ut illius civitatis episcopus primas esset proconsularis provinciæ, immo vero et caput reliquarum quinque provinciarum, quas enumeravi. Non moror in probando speciali isto Africanarum ecclesiarum usu, qui primatum provinciæ non civitatibus sed personis dabat. Abunde id præstiterunt eruditi viri, adductis et discussis locis ex Augustino, Africanis Conciliis, Gregorio Primo, et Leone Nono, petitis: explosa recentiori quadam opinione, quæ primates vagos et desultorios in Africa ratione antiquioris ordinationis fatetur, sed metropoleon episcopis subditos fuisse contendit.

[38] Stillingfleet, Unreason. of Separat. part. 3. t. 9. p. 253. (v. 2. p. 584.).. In the other provinces by seniority of consecration.—Cf. Fell. in C. Carth. ap. Cypr. p. 230. (p. 159. n. 2.) Porro notandum in Africa primates non ab urbium opibus aut prærogativa, sed secundum tempus suæ ordinationis.... censeri solitos, atque ideo senes appellabantur.

[39] Ep. 261. [al. 209.] (t. 2. p. 779 b.) Exsistunt exempla, ipsa sede apostolica judicante, vel aliorum judicata firmante, quosdam pro culpis quibusdam, nec episcopali spoliatos honore, nec relictos omnimodis impunitos. Quæ ut a nostris temporibus remotissima non requiram, recentia memorabo. Clamet Priscus, provinciæ Cæsariensis episcopus, Aut ad primatum locus, sicut cæteris, et mihi patere debuit; aut episcopatus mihi remanere non debuit, &c.

[40] Vid. C. Milev. 1. in Cod. Afric. c. 86. See n. 31, preceding.

and day of his consecration[41]. Thirdly, all bishops were to take place according to seniority, and so sit and vote, and have their names subscribed in council: which was a rule not only in Afric[42], but in all other Churches, being enacted by several Councils[43], and inserted into the Civil Law[44] by Justinian the emperor. But they were the more nice in observing this in Afric, where the primacy went by seniority, lest the neglect of it should have bred confusion among them. Insomuch that St. Austin[45] blames Victorinus, who pretended to be primate of Numidia, only because in his *tractoria*, or *letter of summons* to a provincial council, he wrote the names of the Numidian bishops in a confused order, and put Austin's name before many of his seniors; 'which was a thing,' he says, 'equally injurious to them, and invidious to himself.' So cautious was he of doing any thing that might seem to entrench upon this rule, for fear of breeding confusion in the government of their churches.

Three sorts of honorary primates, besides the primate in power.

9. I must here take notice further, that besides the primacy of power, there was in most provinces also *a primacy of honour*; whence some bishops had the name and title of *primates* who had not the jurisdiction. And these were of three

[41] Vid. C. Milev. c. 14. (t. 2. p. 1541 e.) Placuit ut, quicunque deinceps ab episcopis ordinantur, literas accipiant ab ordinatoribus suis, manu eorum subscriptas, continentes consulem et diem, ut nulla altercatio de posterioribus vel anterioribus oriatur.

[42] Ibid. c. 13. (b.) Posteriores anterioribus deferant, &c.—Conf. Vit. Fulgent. c. 20. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 9. p. 11 e. 8, 13.) Inter .... episcopos .... tempore ordinationis inferior .... ultimus sedebat.

[43] C. Bracar. 1. c. 24. [al. Bracar. 2. c. 6.] (t. 5. p. 840 e.) Item placuit, ut, conservato metropolitani episcopi primatu, cæteri episcoporum, secundum suæ ordinationis tempus, alius alio sedendi deferat locum.—C. Tolet. 4. c. 4. (ibid. p. 1704 e.) Hora itaque prima diei ante solis ortum ejicientur omnes ab ecclesia, observatisque foribus cuncti ad unam januam, per quam sacerdotes ingredi oportet, ostiarii stent; et convenientes omnes episcopi pariter introeant, et secundum ordinationis suæ tempora resideant.

[44] Cod. Justin. l. 1. tit. 4. c. 30. (t. 4. p. 166 sub init.) .... *Τριῶν ἅμα τῷ μητροπολίτῃ συνιόντων θεοφιλεστάτων ἐπισκόπων, τῶν κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τῆς χειροτονίας πρωτευόντων, κ. τ. λ.*

[45] Ep. 217. [al. 59.] ad Victorin. (t. 2. p. 146 g.) Legi in eadem tractoria etiam ad Mauritanias esse scriptum, quas provincias scimus suos habere primates. Quod si et ex eis ad Numidiam convocandum esset concilium, oportuit utique ut aliquorum Maurorum episcoporum, qui illic priores sunt, nomina in tractoria ponerentur: quod in ista tractoria non reperiens, multum miratus sum. Deinde ad ipsos Numidas ita perturbato et neglecto ordine scriptum, ut nomen meum tertio loco invenerim, qui novi quam post multos episcopos factus sim: quæ res et aliis injuriosa est satis, et mihi invidiosa.

sorts. First the *primates ævo*, the oldest bishop in each province next to the metropolitan. These had no power above others, except when the metropolitan was some way disabled, or unqualified for discharging his office by irregularity or suspension: then his power of course devolved to the senior bishop of the province. And this, I conceive, was the reason why the bishop of Amastris[46] presided in council over the bishops of Pontus, when yet Heraclea, and not Amastris, was the metropolis of the province. 1. P ævo.

10. The second sort of honorary primates were *the titular metropolitans*, which were the bishops of such cities as had the name and title of civil metropoles bestowed on them by some emperor, without the power and privileges, which were still retained to the ancient metropolis of the province. Thus Marcian the emperor dignified the city Chalcedon with the title of a metropolis, and the honour was confirmed to the bishop by the Council of Chalcedon[47] itself, only with a *salvo jure* to the rights of Nicomedia, the old metropolis: from that time therefore the bishop of Chalcedon styled himself metropolitan of Bithynia, as may be seen in the Acts[48] of the sixth General Council. The same honour was done to the city and bishop of Nice, in the Council of Chalcedon[49] likewise. So that here were three metropolitans in one province, but one only had the power; the privileges of the other two were only honorary, to sit and vote in council next to their metropolitan. Yet this gave such bishops an opportunity to exalt themselves, and sometimes they so far encroached upon the rights of the first metropolitan as to draw off his suffragans, and divide the 2. T metr tans.

[46] Vid. Euseb. l. 5. c. 23. See before, s. 4. p. 175. n. 12.

[47] Act. 6. (t. 4. p. 611 b.) *Ὁ θειότατος καὶ εὐσεβέστατος ἡμῶν δεσπότης πρὸς τὴν ἁγίαν σύνοδον εἶπεν· Εἰς τιμὴν τῆς τε ἁγίας μάρτυρος Εὐφημίας, καὶ τῆς ὑμετέρας ὁσιότητος, τὴν Καλχηδονέων πόλιν, ἐν ᾗ τῆς ἁγίας πίστεως σύνοδος διεκροτήθη, μητροπόλεως ἔχειν πρεσβεῖα ἐθεσπίσαμεν, ὀνόματι μόνῳ ταύτην τιμήσαντες, σωζομένου δηλαδὴ τῇ Νικομηδέων μητροπόλει τοῦ ἰδίου ἀξιώματος. Πάντες ἐβόησαν· Δικαία ἡ κρίσις τοῦ βασιλέως.*

[48] Act. 18. (t. 6. p. 1030 e.) *Ἰωάννης, ἐλάχιστος ἐπίσκοπος τῆς Καλχηδονέων μητροπόλεως τῆς Βιθυνῶν ἐπαρχίας ὁρίσας, ὑπέγραψα.*

[49] Act. 13. (t. 4. p. 715 b.) *Τὸ δὲ θεῖον γράμμα τῆς θείας λέξεως Οὐαλεντινιανοῦ καὶ Οὐάλεντος, τηνικαῦτα τῇ Νικαέων παρασχὸν τὸ μητροπολιτικὸν δίκαιον, ἰδικῶς παρακελεύεται τῶν ἄλλων μηδὲν ὑφαιρεῖσθαι πόλεων.*— Ibid. (c. d.) .... *Αἱ νομοθεσίαι .... ὀνόματι μητροπόλεως μόνῳ ἐτίμησαν τὴν Νικαέων, προτιμᾶται δὲ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐπισκόπων τῆς ἐπαρχίας τῇ τιμῇ μόνῃ.*

province with him. Thus it was [with] the bishop of Nice, who, before the time of the sixth General Council, had got a synod of suffragans under him; for so Photius subscribed himself in that Council[50], bishop of Nice, and metropolitan of Bithynia, for himself and the synod that was under him.

11. Besides these there were a third sort of primates, who, though they were neither bishops of titular metropoles, nor the oldest bishops of the province, yet took place of all the rest by a general deference that was paid to them, out of regard to *the eminency of their see*, being some mother-church, or particularly honoured by ancient prescription. This was the case of the bishop of Jerusalem. That city was no metropolis of the Empire, but subject to Cæsarea, the metropolis of Palestine; yet in regard that it was the mother-church of the world, this peculiar honour was paid to it, that the bishop thereof was always next in dignity to the metropolitan of Cæsarea, and took place of all the other bishops of the province. And this privilege was confirmed to him by the Nicene Council, which made a canon[51] to this purpose: 'that, whereas by ancient custom and tradition the bishop of Ælia had a particular honour paid him, the same should be continued to him, still reserving to the metropolis the dignity and privilege which belonged to it.' Some[52] fondly imagine that this canon gave the bishop of Jerusalem patriarchal power; whereas it does not so much as make him a metropolitan, but leaves him subject to the metropolis of Palestine, which was Cæsarea, as St. Jerom[53] informs us; whose words clear the sense of this canon, and prove that the bishop of Jerusalem was no metropolitan, as Valesius[54] imagines, but had only the second place of honour

[50] Act. 18. (t. 6. p. 1079 c.) Φώτιος, ἐλέῳ Θεοῦ ἐπίσκοπος τῆς Νικαέων μητροπόλεως τῆς Βιθυνῶν ἐπαρχίας, ὑπὲρ ἐμαυτοῦ καὶ τῆν ὑπ' ἐμὲ συνόδου ὁμοίως ὑπεσημηνάμην.

[51] C. 7. (t. 2. p. 32 c.) Ἐπειδὴ συνήθεια κεκράτηκε καὶ παράδοσις ἀρχαία, ὥστε τὸν ἐν Αἰλίᾳ ἐπίσκοπον τιμᾶσθαι, ἔχετω τὴν ἀκολουθίαν τῆς τιμῆς, τῇ μητροπόλει σωζομένου τοῦ οἰκείου ἀξιώματος.

[52] Sylvius, Addit. ad Caranzed. Summ. Concil. (p. 38. col. dextr.) *habet consequenter honorem*, id est, post Romanum, Alexandrinum, et Antiochenum episcopum.

[53] Ep. 61. ad Pammach. (al. Lib. cont. Joan. Hierosol.] (t. 2. p. 447 b.) .. Hoc ibi decernitur, ut Palæstinæ metropolis Cæsarea sit.

[54] Not. in Euseb. l. v. c. 23. (v. 1. p. 242. n. 6.) Nam Cæsariensis episcopus, ante concilium Nicænum et diu postea, metropolitani honorem et dignitatem semper obtinuit; ita ut omnibus Palæstinæ conciliis præsideret, tamquam primæ sedis episcopus. Nihilominus tamen Hiero-

assigned him next to his metropolitan, which was that honorary primacy which the bishops of Jerusalem had always enjoyed: because, as the Council of Constantinople words it[55], 'Jerusalem was the mother of all other Churches.'

The offices of metropolitans.

To ordain their suffragan bishops.

12. But leaving these honorary primates, who had little more than a name, I am here to shew what were the offices and privileges of those who were *properly metropolitans;* and they were these that follow. First, they were to regulate the elections of all their provincial bishops, and either ordain or authorize the ordination of them. No bishop was to be elected or ordained without their consent and approbation: otherwise the canons pronounce both the election and the ordination null. 'The *κῦρος* or *ratification* of all that is done,' says the Council of Nice[56], 'belongs to the metropolitan in every province.' And again, if any bishop is made without the consent of the metropolitan, this great Synod[57] pronounces such a one to be no bishop. The same rule is repeated in the Councils of Antioch[58], Laodicea[59], Arles[60], Turin[61], Sardica[62], Ephesus[63], and Chalcedon[64]. And whereas some pretend that the African

solymorum episcopis honor semper est habitus, utpote apostolicæ ecclesiæ, quæ prima episcopum habuisset. Itaque quodam honoris privilegio fruebantur ejus sedis episcopi; nec Cæsariensi episcopo subjacebant, sed erant *αὐτοκέφαλοι*.

[55] Ep. Synod. ad Damas. (t. 2. p. 966 b.) *Τῆς δέ γε μητρὸς ἁπασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις.*

[56] C. 4. (ibid. p. 29 e.) *Τὸ δὲ κῦρος τῶν γινομένων δίδοσθαι καθ' ἑκάστην ἐπαρχίαν τῷ μητροπολίτῃ.*

[57] C. 6. (ibid. p. 32 d.) *Καθόλου δὲ πρόδηλον ἐκεῖνο, ὅτι εἴ τις χωρὶς γνώμης τοῦ μητροπολίτου γένοιτο ἐπίσκοπος, τὸν τοιοῦτον ἡ μεγάλη σύνοδος ὥρισε μὴ δεῖν εἶναι ἐπίσκοπον.*

[58] C. 19. (ibid. p. 569 c.) *Ἐπίσκοπον μὴ χειροτονεῖσθαι δίχα συνόδου καὶ παρουσίας τοῦ ἐν τῇ μητροπόλει τῆς ἐπαρχίας.*

[59] C. 12. (t. 1. p. 1497 e.) *Περὶ τοῦ, τοὺς ἐπισκόπους κρίσει τῶν μητροπολιτῶν, καὶ τῶν πέριξ ἐπισκόπων, καθίστασθαι εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν ἀρχήν.*

[60] Arelat. 2. c. 5. (t. 4. p. 1011 e.) Episcopum sine metropolitano, vel epistola metropolitani, vel tribus comprovincialibus, non liceat ordinare.—C. 6. (ibid. p. 1012 a.) Illud autem ante omnia clareat, eum, qui sine conscientia metropolitani constitutus fuerit episcopus, juxta magnam synodum esse episcopum non debere.

[61] C. 1. (t. 2. p. 155 c.).... Cum primum omnium vir sanctus Proculus, Massiliensis episcopus, civitatis se tamquam metropolitanum ecclesiis, quæ in secunda provincia Narbonensi positæ videbantur, diceret præesse debere, atque per se ordinationes in memorata provincia summorum fieri sacerdotum, &c.

[62] C. 6. See before, s. 5. p. 176. n. 19.

[63] Decret. de Episc. Cyprian. (t. 3. p. 802 b.) *Ἔξουσι τὸ ἀνεπηρέαστον καὶ ἀβίαστον οἱ τῶν ἁγίων ἐκκλησιῶν τῶν κατὰ τὴν Κύπρον προεστῶτες, κατὰ τοὺς κανόνας τῶν ὁσίων πατέρων καὶ τὴν ἀρχαίαν συνήθειαν, δι' ἑαυτῶν τὰς χειροτονίας τῶν εὐλαβεστάτων ἐπισκόπων ποιούμενοι.*

[64] Act. 13. (t. 4. p. 714 a.) *Τὸ δὲ κῦρος τῶν γινομένων διοίσει καθ' ἑκά-*

primates had not this power, the contrary appears evidently from several canons of their Councils. The second Council of Carthage[65] says, 'No one shall presume to ordain a bishop without consulting the primate of the province and taking his precept, though many other bishops should join with him.' The third Council of Carthage requires but three bishops to the ordination of a bishop, but then[66] 'they must be such as are expressly authorized by the metropolitan.' And the fourth Council[67] requires either his presence, or at least his authority and commission. Here a primate and a metropolitan are the same thing, *viz.* the senior bishop of the province, who usually went to the church, where the new bishop was to be placed, and consecrated him with his own hands; as St. Austin and Possidius[68] testify, who are good witnesses of their practice.

13. Nor was this power at all infringed by setting up of patriarchs above them. For, though the metropolitans were then to be ordained by the patriarchs, and obliged to attend on them for it, who before were ordained by their own provincial synod, yet still the right of ordaining their own suffragans was all along preserved to them, and expressly confirmed by the Council of Chalcedon[69]; nor do we ever find any patriarch assuming this power, except the bishop of Alexandria for a particular reason: of which I shall give an account in the following chapter, sect. 11.

14. But here I must observe, that *this power of metropolitans was not arbitrary.* For though no bishop was to be elected or ordained without their consent, yet they had no negative voice in the matter, but were to be determined and

στην ἐπαρχίαν τῷ μητροπολίτῃ.—C. 25. (ibid. p. 767 a.) Ἐπειδή τινες τῶν μητροπολιτῶν .... ἀναβάλλονται τὰς χειροτονίας τῶν ἐπισκόπων.

[65] C. 12. (t. 2. p. 1162 e.) Inconsulto [al. contempto] primate cujuslibet provinciæ suæ .... nemo præsumat, licet cum multis episcopis, ... sine ejus præcepto episcopum ordinare.

[66] C. 39. (ibid. p. 1173 a.) Non minus quam tres sufficiant, qui fuerint a metropolitano directi [al. destinati] ad ordinandum episcopum.

[67] C. 1. (ibid. p. 1199 d.) Conventu totius provinciæ episcoporum, maximeque metropolitani vel præsentia vel auctoritate, ordinetur episcopus.

[68] Ep. 261. See before, s. 6. p. p. 177. latter part of n. 26.—Vit. August. c. 8. (t. 10. append. p. 262 e.) Adveniente ad ecclesiam Hipponensem tunc primate Numidiæ Megalio, ... episcopatum suscipere contra morem ecclesiæ, suo vivente episcopo, presbyter recusabat.

[69] Act. 16. (t. 4. pp. 818 b, seqq.) .... Ἐκ τῶν πεπραγμένων, κ. τ. λ.

concluded by the major part of a provincial synod. For so the Council of Arles[70] decreed, 'that if there arose any doubt or hesitation betwixt the parties, the metropolitan should side with the greater number.' And the Council of Nice[71], to the same purpose: 'If two or three, out of a contentious humour, shall oppose the common election, duly and regularly made, according to the canons of the Church, in this case let the majority of voices prevail.'

vote of a provincial synod.

15. And the same rule was to be observed in the ordination of metropolitans themselves, who were to be *chosen and consecrated by their own provincial bishops;* who were not obliged to send for a metropolitan out of another province to do it, but they had power to do it in their own provincial synod among themselves. This, St. Austin says, was the custom of the Catholic Church, both in Afric and Rome. And therefore, when the Donatists objected against Cæcilian, primate of Carthage, 'that his ordination was uncanonical, because he had not sent for the neighbouring primate of Numidia to come and ordain him,' his answer was[72], 'that Cæcilian had no need of this, since the custom of the Catholic Church was otherwise; which was, not to have the Numidian bishops to ordain the bishop of Carthage, but the neighbouring bishops of the province of Carthage: as it was not the custom at Rome to send for a metropolitan out of another province to ordain the bishop of Rome, but he was always ordained by the bishop of Ostia, a neighbouring bishop of the same province.'

Metropolitans to be chosen and ordained by their own provincial synods.

It is true there is a canon in the Council of Sardica[73], which orders *the bishops of the next province,* as some interpret it, to be called into the ordination of a metropolitan,—*τοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς πλησιοχώρου ἐπαρχίας ἐπισκόπους.* But this, perhaps, may as

[70] Arelat. 2. c. 5. (ibid. p. 1012 a.) Quod si inter partes aliqua nata fuerit dubitatio, majori numero metropolitanus in electione consentiat.

[71] C. 6. (t. 2. p. 32 d.) Ἐὰν μέντοι τῇ κοινῇ πάντων ψήφῳ, εὐλόγῳ οὔσῃ, καὶ κατὰ κανόνα ἐκκλησιαστικὸν, δύο ἢ τρεῖς δι' οἰκείαν φιλονεικίαν ἀντιλέγωσι, κρατείτω ἡ τῶν πλειόνων ψῆφος.

[72] August. Brevic. Collat. 3 die. c. 16. (t. 9. p. 570 g.) Et quod non exspectavit Cæcilianus ut princeps a principe ordinaretur; cum aliud habeat Ecclesiæ Catholicæ consuetudo, ut non Numidiæ, sed propinquiores episcopi episcopum ecclesiæ Carthaginis ordinent: sicut nec Romanæ ecclesiæ ordinat aliquis episcopus metropolitanus, sed de proximo Ostiensis episcopus.

[73] C. 6. (t. 2. p. 632 c.) Χρὴ δὲ μετακαλεῖσθαι καὶ τοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς πλησιοχώρου ἐπαρχίας ἐπισκόπους πρὸς τὴν κατάστασιν τοῦ τῆς μητροπόλεως ἐπισκόπου.

well be rendered, *the neighbouring bishops*[74] *of the same province;* and since custom, and the practice of the Church, which is the best interpreter of doubtful canons, does manifestly favour this sense, there is some reason so to understand it. But, however it be, here is no mention of one metropolitan having a right to ordain another. From which it appears, that in these times no metropolitan was obliged to go or send out of his own province, much less to Rome, for his ordination; but all was to be done by his suffragans in his own church. Nor was any bishop obliged to go for ordination to his metropolitan's church; but ordinarily the metropolitan, and the rest of the bishops, met synodically in the vacant church, and there elected and consecrated a new bishop, in the presence of the people, for whom they ordained him. This was the first part of the metropolitan's office.

ie second office of metropolitans, to decide controversies among their provincial bishops, and to take appeals from them.

16. Their next office was to *preside over their provincial bishops*, and, if any controversies arose among them, to interpose their authority to end and decide them; as also to hear the accusations of others, who complained of injury done them by their own bishops, from whom there was liberty always to appeal to their metropolitan. Thus in Afric it was ordained, by the Council of Milevis[75], 'that if two bishops disputed about the bounds of their dioceses, the metropolitan should appoint a committee of bishops to hear and determine their controversy.' If a presbyter or deacon was excommunicated by his own bishop, the Council of Sardica[76] allows him liberty to appeal to the metropolitan of his province; or, if he were absent, to the metropolitan of the next province, to desire a new hearing of his cause. In such cases as these, the metropolitan had three ways of proceeding. Either, first, he was to appoint a select number of bishops to be judges, which was the practice of Afric; where such judges were therefore called

[74] Harmenopulus so understood it; for in his Epitome he thus words it: (ap. Leunclav. Jur. Gr.-Rom. t. 1. p. 2. col. sinistr. summ.) *Οἱ πλησιόχωροι τῆς ἐπαρχίας παρέστωσαν.*

[75] C. 21. (t. 2. p. 1542 e.) Per episcopos judices causa finiatur, sive quos eis primates dederint, sive quos ipsi vicinos ex consultu primatis delegerint.

[76] C. 14. (t. 2. p. 640 b.) *Ὁ ἐκβαλλόμενος ἐχέτω ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον τῆς μητροπόλεως τῆς αὐτῆς ἐπαρχίας καταφυγεῖν· εἰ δὲ ὁ τῆς μητροπόλεως ἄπεστιν, ἐπὶ τὸν πλησιόχωρον κατατρέχειν, καὶ ἀξιοῦν, ἵνα μετὰ ἀκριβείας αὐτοῦ ἐξετάζηται τὸ πρᾶγμα.*

judices electi[77], and their number assigned to be twelve[78], if a bishop's cause was to be tried before them. Or, secondly, he was to refer the matter to a provincial synod, which seems to have been the general practice, when those called the Apostolical Canons were made; one of which orders[79], 'that when a bishop is accused, he shall be convened before a synod of bishops.' Another says[80], 'the primate shall do nothing without the consent of all the other bishops; so concord will be preserved, and God will be glorified.' And another[81], 'Twice a year let there be a synod of bishops, to examine doctrines of religion, and terminate all ecclesiastical controversies that may happen.' But, thirdly, by Justinian's law[82], the metropolitan has power to hear causes upon appeal himself, without a synod. Yet, whether he could proceed so far as to depose a bishop by his sole authority, is questioned. Spalatensis[83] gives some

[77] Vid. C. Carth. 3. c. 9. (ibid. p. 1169 a.) ... Cui ad eligendos judices undique patet auctoritas. [The Author's edition of 1710 refers to c. 7. of this Council (see p. 198. of v. 1.), which is repeated in the folio edition of 1726 (see v. 1. p. 64). But that canon relates not to these *judices electi*. Availing myself of the help of Grischovius, I have cited the ninth canon, as being the only passage in the Council that answers to the author's meaning in the text. Ed.]

[78] Vid. C. Carth. 1. c. 11. (ibid. p. 717 b.) ... Si episcopus, a duodecim consacerdotibus audiatur.

[79] Can. Apost. 73. (Cotel. [c. 66.] v. 1. p. 447.) .... Ἡ σύνοδος ἀποφαινέσθω κατ' αὐτοῦ τὰ δοκοῦντα.—Conf. C. Constant. Gen. 2. c. 6. (t. 2. p. 950 d.) Εἰ συμβαίη ἀδυνατῆσαι τοὺς ἐπαρχιώτας πρὸς διόρθωσιν τῶν ἐπιφερομένων ἐγκλημάτων τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, τότε αὐτοὺς προσιέναι μείζονι συνόδῳ τῶν τῆς διοικήσεως ἐπισκόπων ἐκείνης, ὑπὲρ τῆς αἰτίας ταύτης συγκαλουμένων.

[80] Can. Apost. 33. (Cotel. [c. 27.] ibid. p. 442.) .... Ἀλλὰ μηδὲ ἐκεῖνος ἄνευ τῆς πάντων γνώμης ποιείτω τί· οὕτως γὰρ ὁμόνοια ἔσται, καὶ δοξασθήσεται ὁ Θεὸς διὰ Χριστοῦ [al. Κυρίου] ἐν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι.—Conf. C. Antioch. c. 9. (t. 2. p. 565 c.)..... Περαιτέρω δὲ μηδὲν πράττειν ἐπιχειρεῖν δίχα τοῦ τῆς μητροπόλεως ἐπισκόπου, μηδὲ αὐτὸν ἄνευ τῆς τῶν λοιπῶν γνώμης.

[81] Can. Apost. 36. (Cotel. [c. 30.] ibid. p. 442.) Δεύτερον τοῦ ἔτους σύνοδος γινέσθω τῶν ἐπισκόπων, καὶ ἀνακρινέτωσαν ἀλλήλους τὰ δόγματα τῆς εὐσεβείας, καὶ τὰς ἐμπιπτούσας ἐκκλησιαστικὰς ἀντιλογίας διαλυέτωσαν.

[82] Cod. l. 1. tit. 4. leg. 30. (t. 4. p. 166.) Θεσπίζομεν μηδένα τῶν εὐλαβεστάτων κληρικῶν, εἴτε παρά τινος συγκληρικοῦ, εἴτε παρὰ τῶν καλουμένων λαϊκῶν τινὸς, εὐθὺς καὶ ἐκ πρώτης ἐν αἰτιάσει γίνεσθαι παρὰ τοῖς μακαριωτάτοις πατριάρχαις διοικήσεως ἑκάστης· ἀλλὰ πρῶτον κατὰ τοὺς ἱεροὺς θεσμοὺς παρὰ τῷ τῆς πόλεως ἐπισκόπῳ, καθ' ἣν ὁ κληρικὸς διάγει· εἰ δὲ ὑπόπτως ἔχει πρὸς ἐκεῖνον, παρὰ τῷ τῆς μετροπόλεως ἐπισκόπῳ τοῦτο πράττειν, κ. τ. λ.

[83] De Republ. part. 1. l. 3. c. 7. n. 19. (p. 458. 5.) Sed nunc factis ipsis, ac præsertim pœnis, nec levibus illatis, metropolitanorum potestatem erga suos episcopos confirmemus. Et sane censuris omnibus posse metropolitanum in suos suffraganeos ex causa agere, concedunt apertissime Canonistæ. Facta

instances of bishops that were deposed by their metropolitans; but, for aught that appears, it was done in synod. But whether it was, or was not, matters not much; for still, in all cases, by the same law of Justinian[84] and the canons, there lay an appeal from the metropolitan to a provincial synod, of which he was only the president, or moderator and director of business in it.

Their third office, to call provincial synods, which the suffragans were obliged to attend.

17. And this leads us to a third office of the metropolitans, which was *to call provincial synods, and preside in them.* For since the canons[85] appointed two synods to be held ordinarily every year, in each province, besides such as might be called upon extraordinary occasions, it was necessary some one should be appointed to give notice of the time and place, and have authority both to convocate, and to preside in them. All things therefore relating to this matter were, by common consent, put into the primate's power, whose circular letters, which sometimes are called *synodicæ* and *tractoriæ*[86], as the Emperor's were called *sacræ*, were a legal summons, which no bishop of the province might disobey, under pain of suspension.

vero catholicorum metropolitanorum jam accipe, quæ mihi occurrunt insigniora. In civitate Ephesina, quando in ea tertia œcumenica synodus celebrabatur, inventi sunt aliquot episcopi, qui gravibus de causis a suis metropolitanis erant depositi: ut narrant patres illius concilii in sua Synodica ad Cælestinum Romanum pontificem, [ap. Cyril. Alex. Ep. 12. Synodal.] dum conqueruntur, Joannem Antiochenum conciliabulum quoddam ex his depositis et ex aliis extorribus, qui nullas habentes ecclesias vagabantur, et ex ejectis, et Pelagianis, ac Cælestianis congregasse. Basilius vero [Ep. 76.] depositionem minatur suis suffraganeis, si propter pecuniam faciant ordinationes. Ibas Edessenus a suis clericis accusatus, [C. Chalced. Act. 9.] judicatus fuit ab Antiocheno primate in synodo: Florentinus Epidaurensis episcopus [Greg. l. 2. ind. 2. ep. 9. et l. 7. ind. 1. ep. 13.] a Natali Salonitano in exilium pulsus est, etc.

[84] Cod. l. 1. tit. 4. leg. 30. (t. 4. p. 166.) Εἰ δὲ (ὡς εἰκὸς) οὔτε τὰ κατ' ἐκεῖνον αὐτῷ ἀρέσκοι, τηνικαῦτα πρὸς τὴν εὐαγῆ σύνοδον τὴν τῆς χώρας ἄγειν αὐτὸν δικαζόμενον, κ. τ. λ.

[85] Vid. C. Nicæn. c. 5. (t. 2. p. 32a.) Καλῶς ἔχειν ἔδοξεν, ἑκάστου ἐνιαυτοῦ καθ' ἑκάστην ἐπαρχίαν δὶς τοῦ ἔτους συνόδους γίνεσθαι. — C. Antioch. c. 20. (ibid. p. 569 e.) Καλῶς ἔχειν ἔδοξε συνόδους καθ' ἑκάστην ἐπαρχίαν τῶν ἐπισκόπων γίνεσθαι δεύτερον τοῦ ἔτους.—C. Agathens. c. 35. (t. 4. p. 1389 b.) Si metropolitanus episcopus ad comprovinciales epistolas direxerit, in quibus eos aut ad ordinationem summi pontificis, aut ad synodum invitet, postpositis omnibus, excepta gravi infirmitate corporis, aut præceptione regia, ad constitutam diem adesse non differant. —C. Arelat. 2. c. 18. (ibid. p. 1013 e.) Ad Arelatensis episcopi arbitrium synodus congreganda, &c.— Can. Apost. 36. (Cotel. [c. 30.] v. 1. p. 442.) Δεύτερον τοῦ ἔτους σύνοδος γινέσθω τῶν ἐπισκόπων.

[86] Ap. August. Ep. 217. [al. 59.] ad Victorin. (t. 2. p. 146 f.) Tractoria ad me quinto idus Novembris venit, &c.

or some such canonical censure, which is left to the discretion[87] of the metropolitan and the council.

18. It belonged to metropolitans *to publish and disperse such imperial laws and canons* as were, either by Councils or Emperors, made for the common good of the Church. This they are required to do by several laws[88] both of the Church and State, the better to diffuse the knowledge and enforce the practice of them. Nor were they only to disperse the canons that were made, but to see that they were observed; which gave them right to visit and inquire into neglects, abuses, and disorders, committed by any bishop throughout the whole province. The metropolitan, in this respect, is said to have the care of the whole province, by the Council of Antioch[89]. Not that this gave him power to officiate in any other bishop's church, or perform such acts as the bishop himself might perform alone;—such as the ordaining of presbyters and deacons, and the like, which are specialties of every bishop, reserved to them by the same Council;—but, in case of omission, or scandalous neglect, the bishop of the metropolis was to manifest his care, with the advice of the rest of his brethren.

4. M polit publi peria and visit ses, corre abus

19. In Afric all bishops paid a peculiar deference to the primate, *in taking his license to travel*, whenever they were called into a foreign country upon extraordinary occasions.

5. Bi not with lette

[87] Vid. C. Chalced. c. 19. (t. 4. p. 766 a.) Τοὺς δὲ μὴ συνιόντας ἐπισκόπους, ἐκδημοῦντας ταῖς ἑαυτῶν πόλεσι, καὶ ταῦτα, ἐν ὑγείᾳ διάγοντας, καὶ πάσης ἀπαραιτήτου καὶ ἀναγκαίας ἀσχολίας ὄντας ἐλευθέρους, ἀδελφικῶς ἐπιπλήττεσθαι.—C. Carth. 4. c. 21. (t. 2. p. 1201 e.) Ut episcopus ad synodum ire non sine satis gravi necessitate inhibeatur. — Theodor. Ep. 81. (t. 4. part. 2. p. 1139.) Αἰτία δὲ οὐδεμία τῇ δοκούσῃ πρόσκειται τιμωρίᾳ, ἀλλ' ὅτι συνόδους ἐπισκοπικὰς συναθροίζω.—Ibid. (p. 1140.) Καὶ ὑπήκουον τῷ ἐκκλησιαστικῷ κανόνι πειθόμενος, ὃς κινδυνεύειν παρακελεύεται τὸν καλούμενον εἰς σύνοδον, καὶ παραγίνεσθαι μὴ βουλόμενον.

[88] Novel. 6. c. 8. (t. 5. p. 60. ad calc.) Sanctissimi siquidem patriarchæ uniuscujusque diœcesis hæc proponant in ecclesiis sub se constitutis: et manifesta faciant Deo amabilibus metropolitis, quæ a nobis constituta sunt. Illi quoque rursus etiam ipsi proponant ea in metropolitana sanctissima ecclesia; et constitutis sub se episcopis hæc manifesta faciant. Illorum vero singuli in propria ecclesia hæc proponant: ut nullus nostræ reipublicæ ignoret, quæ a nobis ad honorem et ad augmentum magni Dei et Salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi disposita sunt. —Novel. 42. Epilog. (ibid. p. 255.) Custodiat itaque beatitudo tua, quæ recte annotata sunt, et mittat ipsa per suas Deo dilectas literas omnibus sanctissimis metropolitis sub ipsa existentibus, quorum cuilibet cura erit ipsa manifesta facere sanctissimis ecclesiis sub ipsis ordinatis, &c.

[89] C. 9. (t. 2. p. 565 a.) Τοὺς καθ' ἑκάστην ἐπαρχίαν ἐπισκόπους εἰδέναι χρὴ τὸν ἐν τῇ μητροπόλει προεστῶτα ἐπίσκοπον, καὶ τὴν φροντίδα ἀναδέχεσθαι πάσης τῆς ἐπαρχίας.

eir me-
opolitan.

This was expressly provided by a canon of the third Council of Carthage[89], 'that no bishop should go beyond sea without consulting his primate, and taking his *formatæ*, or *letters of commendation*.' Nor was this so peculiar to Afric, but that we may meet with the same rule and practice in other places, even as low as the time of Gregory the Great; who, in one of his Epistles[90], gives the same direction to some bishops, in reference to their metropolitan, 'that they should not travel upon urgent occasion, without his letters of concession.'

Metro-
olitans to
ke care of
cant sees
ithin their
ovince.

20. It belonged to metropolitans *to take care of all vacant sees within their province*, to administer the affairs of the church during the vacancy, to secure the revenues of the bishopric, and procure a speedy election of a new bishop. In Afric, the primate commonly appointed one of the neighbouring bishops to be his vicegerent in such a case, whom, therefore, the canons, as has been observed before, call an interventor[91]. The Council of Riez[92], in France, in like manner, puts the administration of a vacant see into the hands of a neighbouring bishop, under the inspection of the metropolitan. And the Council of Valencia[93], in Spain, authorizes the metropolitans to

[89] C. 28. (ibid. p. 1171 c.) Item placuit, ut episcopi trans mare non proficiscantur, nisi consulto primæ sedis episcopo, &c.

[90] L. 8. Ep. 8. (CC. t. 5. p. 1315 b.) Additur etiam quod ex vobis aliqui, pro ecclesiæ suæ emergentibus causis, transmarina petentes, sine prædicti metropolitani sui cognitione vel epistolis, sicut canonum ordo constituit, audeant ambulare. Hortamur ergo fraternitatem vestram, ut antiquam ecclesiarum vestrarum consuetudinem exsequentes, tam de suscipienda paschali denuntiatione, quam etiam si quemdam vestrum pro causis propriis ubicumque compulerit ambulare necessitas, ab eodem metropolitano vestro, secundum indictam vobis regulam, petere licentiam debeatis.

[91] Vid. C. Carth. 5. c. 8. (t. 2. p. 1216 e.) Dare operam, ut intra annum eisdem episcopum provideat: quod si neglexerit, anno exemto, [al. expleto,] interventor alius tribuatur.

[92] C. 6. (t. 3. p. 1288 b.) Ne quis ad eam ecclesiam, quæ episcopum perdidisset, nisi vicinæ ecclesiæ episcopus, exsequiarum tempore accederet; qui, visitatoris vice, tamen statim ecclesiæ ipsius curam districtissime gereret, ne quid ante ordinationem discordantium in novitatibus clericorum subversioni liceret. Itaque cum tale aliquid accidit, vicinis vicinarum ecclesiarum inspectio, recensio, descriptioque mandatur.

[93] C. 2. (t. 4. p. 1618 a.) Hoc etiam placuit, ut episcopo ab hoc sæculo, jubente Domino, accersito, clerici ab omni omnino supellectili, vel quæcumque sunt in domo ecclesiæ, vel episcopi, in libris, in speciebus, utensilibus, vasculis, frugibus, gregibus, animalibus, vel omni omnino re, rapaces manus abstineant, et nihil latronum more diripiant. Qui si nec canonum auctoritate cohibiti fuerint, omnia quæ pervaserint, metropolitani vel omnium comprovincialium sacerdotum districtione coacti, in pristinum sta-

punish purloiners of the revenues in the vacancy, and to send an administrator till a new bishop is chosen. By a canon of the Council of Chalcedon[94], the care of the revenues of the church is committed to the steward of the church, the *œconomus;* but the care of supplying the vacant see with a new bishop, within three months, is the business of the metropolitan.

7. Metropolitan calculi the ti Easte

21. It belonged to the metropolitan yearly *to review the calculation of the time of Easter*, and give notice to suffragans of it. The care of composing the cycle indeed was by the Nicene fathers particularly committed to the bishop of Alexandria, as Pope Leo[95] and others inform us; and he was to give notice to other Churches. But due care was not always taken in this matter; and therefore the metropolitan in every province was concerned to settle the time, and acquaint the whole province with it. As we find St. Ambrose[96] did for the province of Milan; and the bishop of Carthage[97] for the province of Afric: and the Spanish Councils[98] order their metro-

tum reddere integra cogantur.... Dehinc ad metropolitani notitiam habita ordinatio vel descriptio deferatur: ut ejus electione talis persona ordinandæ domus ecclesiasticæ procuretur, quæ vel consueta clericis stipendia dispenset, et creditarum sibi rerum.... metropolitano congruis temporibus reddere possit rationem.

[94] C. 25. (ibid. p. 767 b.) Ἐπειδὴ δέ τινες τῶν μητροπολιτῶν ..... ἀναβάλλονται τὰς χειροτονίας τῶν ἐπισκόπων, ἔδοξε τῇ ἁγίᾳ συνόδῳ ἐντὸς τριῶν μηνῶν γίνεσθαι τὰς χειροτονίας τῶν ἐπισκόπων ..... τὴν μέντοι πρόσοδον τῆς χηρευούσης ἐκκλησίας σώαν φυλάττεσθαι παρὰ τῷ οἰκονόμῳ τῆς ἐκκλησίας.

[95] Ep. 62. al. 70. ad Marcian. Imper. (CC. ibid. p. 886 a.) Petitionem autem de festivitate paschali gaudeo ita a vestra pietate susceptam, ut confestim Nectarium agentem in rebus Alexandriam mitteret, de errore removendo, quem sanctæ memoriæ Theophili constitutio videtur inferre.

[96] Ep. 83. [al. 23.] ad Episc. per Æmiliam. (t. 2. pp. 880, seqq.) Non mediocris esse sapientiæ, &c.

[97] Vid. C. Carth. 3. c. 1. (t. 2. p. 1167 c.) Placuit .. in principio, propter errorem qui sæpe solet oboriri, ut omnes Africanæ provinciæ episcopi observationem paschalem ab ecclesia Carthaginensi curent accipere.—It. c. 41. (ibid. p. 1173 d.) Adjicimus etiam de die paschæ nobis esse mandatum, ut de ecclesia semper Carthaginensi .... instruamur.

[98] C. Bracar. 2. [Labb. 3.] c. 9. (t. 5. p. 898 c.) Placuit ut, postquam omnia in concilio sacerdotum fuerint ordinata, illud omnibus modis observetur, ut superventurum ipsius anni pascha quoto calendarum die, vel quota luna, debet suscipi, a metropolitano episcopo nuntietur. Ed.]—C. Tolet. 4. c. 5. (ibid. p. 1706 a.).. Placuit, ut ante tres menses Epiphaniorum metropolitani sacerdotes literis invicem se inquirant: ut communi scientia edocti, diem resurrectionis Christi et comprovincialibus suis insinuent, et uno tempore celebrandum adnuntient.

politans first to concert the matter among themselves, and then communicate it their comprovincials.

ow the wer of etropoli- ns grew after es.

22. Some later canons[99] make it the privilege of metropolitans *to consecrate all churches throughout the province.* But I have shewed before, that this was originally the privilege of every bishop in his own diocese; and being a private act, which only concerned his own church, and not the whole province, the metropolitan was to have no hand in it, no more than in the consecration of presbyters and deacons, by the ninth canon of the Council of Antioch. Other canons[1] bind the whole province to follow the forms and rites of divine service used in the metropolitan church: but I have observed before, that anciently every bishop had liberty to prescribe for his own diocese, and was under no limitation as to this matter, unless it were the order of a provincial council.

he primate of lexandria d the eatest wer of y other.

23. By this we see that the power of metropolitans in some places exceeded others. And I must here observe that the primate of Alexandria was the greatest metropolitan in the world, both for the absoluteness of his power, and the extent of his jurisdiction. For he was not metropolitan of a single province, but of all the provinces of Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, in which there were at least six large provinces, out of which sometimes above an hundred bishops were called to a provincial council. Alexander summoned near that number to the condemnation of Arius[2], before the Council of Nice. And

[99] Gelas. Ep. 1. c. 4. (CC. t. 4. p. 1157.) [This citation is wholly erroneous. But see Montan. Toletan. Ep. ad Palentin. ap. Blondel. Apol. s. 3. (p. 150.) Pari ratione cognovimus quod ad consecrationem basilicarum, alienæ sortis a vobis episcopi invitentur, &c.

[1] C. Gerund. c. 1. (t. 4. p. 1568 a.) De institutione missarum, ut quomodo in metropolitana ecclesia fuerit, ita Dei nomine in omni Tarraconensi provincia, tam ipsius missæ ordo, quam psallendi vel ministrandi consuetudo servetur.—C. Epaun. c. 27. (ibid. p. 1579 c.) Ad celebranda divina officia ordinem, quem metropolitani tenent, provinciales eorum observare debebunt.—C. Tolet. II. c. 3. (t. 6. p. 546 d.) De his qui, contra apostoli voluntatem, circumferuntur omni vento doctrinæ, placuit huic sancto concilio, ut metropolitanæ sedis auctoritate coacti uniuscujusque provinciæ pontifices, rectoresque ecclesiarum, unum eumdemque in psallendo teneant modum, quem in metropolitana sede cognoverint institutum; nec aliqua diversitate cujusque ordinis vel officii a metropolitana se patiantur sede disjungi.

[2] Ep. Encycl. ap. Socrat. l. 1. c. 6. (v. 2. p. 12. 19.) .... Ἐγγὺς ἑκατὸν ὄντων κ. τ. λ.

Athanasius[3] speaks of the same number meeting at other times. Particularly the Council of Alexandria, anno 339, which heard and justified the cause of Athanasius after his return from his banishment, had almost an hundred bishops in it; which was above thirty more than the bishop of Rome's *libra*, which was but sixty-nine. Nor was the primate of Alexandria's power less than the extent of his jurisdiction; for he not only ordained all his suffragan bishops, but had liberty to ordain presbyters and deacons in all churches throughout the whole district. Mr. Basnage[4] and Launoy will have it that he had the sole power of ordaining, and that not so much as a presbyter or deacon could be ordained without him. Valesius[5] thinks his privilege was rather that he might ordain if he pleased, but not that he had the sole power of ordaining presbyters and deacons. But either way it was a great privilege, and peculiar to the bishop of Alexandria; for no other metropolitan pretended to the like power besides himself.

All polis call stoli thei sede stoli

24. I have but one thing more to observe concerning metropolitans; which is, that they were anciently all dignified with the name *apostolici;* which was then no peculiar title of the bishop of Rome. For Pope Siricius himself gives all primates[6] this appellation; and it continued to be their title to the days of Alcuin, who[7] speaking of the election of bishops says, 'when the clergy and people have chosen one, they draw up an instrument, and go with their elect to the *apostolicus;*' by whom he means not the Pope, but the primate or metropolitan of every province, who had the right and power of consecration.

[3] Apol. 2. p. 720. (t. 1. part 1. p. 147 f. n. 71.) Ἐπίσκοποί εἰσιν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, καὶ Λιβύῃ, καὶ Πεντακόλει, ἐγγὺς ἑκατόν.—Conf. C. Alexandr. Ep. Encycl. (t. 2. p. 533.) See the inscription.

[4] Exercit. in Baron. an. 39. (p. 307.) Patriarchæ, fatentibus clarissimis viris quibus concurrimus, illi sunt, qui, metropolitanos exercentes metropolitanorum, habent et sibi subjectas plurimas metropolitanas provincias. Hac ex descriptione, si Nicænæ Synodi temporibus nulli erant in Alexandrini episcopi ditione metropolitani quibus præesset, utique nil nisi metropolitanum agebat. Nullos vero Nicænis temporibus apud Ægyptum fuisse metropolitanos eo apparet, quod creandorum et presbyterorum et episcoporum omnium facultas soli episcopo Alexandrino competeret.

[5] Not. in Socrat. l. 3. c. 5. (ibid. p. 395.)

[6] Ep. 4. c. 1. (CC. t. 2. p. 1029 c.) Ut extra conscientiam sedis apostolicæ, hoc est, primatis, nemo audeat ordinare.

[7] De Div. Offic. c. 37. (p. 1083 d.) Cum episcopus civitatis fuerit defunctus, eligitur alius a clero seu populo, fitque decretum ab illis, et veniunt ad apostolicum cum suo electo, &c.

CHAP. XVII.

Of patriarchs.

a 1. NEXT in order to the metropolitans or primates were the
b. *patriarchs*, or, as they were at first called, *archbishops* and *exarchs of the diocese*. For, though now an archbishop and a metropolitan be generally taken for the same, to wit, the primate of a single province, yet anciently the name *archbishop* was a more extensive title, and scarce given to any but those whose jurisdiction extended over a whole imperial diocese; as the bishops of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, &c. That this was so appears evidently from one of Justinian's Novels, where, erecting the bishopric of Justiniana Prima into a patriarchal see, he says[8], 'Our pleasure is, that the bishop of Justiniana shall not only be a metropolitan but an archbishop.' Here the names are clearly distinguished, and an archbishop reckoned superior to a metropolitan. And hence it was, that after the setting up of patriarchal power, the name *archbishop* was appropriated to the patriarchs. Liberatus[9] gives all the patriarchs this title of archbishops. So does the Council of Chalcedon[10] frequently, speaking of the patriarchs of Rome and Constantinople under the name of archbishops also.

2. These were otherwise called ἔξαρχοι τῆς διοικήσεως, ex-
he *archs of the diocese*, to distinguish them from the ἔξαρχοι τῆς ἐπαρχίας, *the exarchs of a single province*, which were only metropolitans. Thus Domnus, bishop of Antioch, is styled *exarch of the eastern diocese* by the Councils of Antioch and Chalcedon[11]. And in the subscriptions of the sixth general

[8] Novel. 11. (t. 5. p. 105 ad calc.) Volumus . . . . ut Primæ Justinianæ, patriæ nostræ, pro tempore sacrosanctus antistes non solum metropolitanus, sed etiam archiepiscopus fiat.

[9] Breviar. c. 17. (CC. t. 5. p. 766 d.) Nec tamen prius hoc faceret, nisi susciperet henoticon principis, et synodicas destinaret epistolas Constantinopolitano Acacio, et Simplicio Romano, et cæteris archiepiscopis.

[10] Act. 10. (t. 4. p. 818 b.) Ἐκ τῶν πεπραγμένων, καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἑκαστου πατριάρχου, συνορῶμεν, πρὸ πάντων μὲν τὰ πρωτεῖα καὶ τὴν ἑξάρχειαν τιμὴν, κατὰ τοὺς κανόνας, τῷ τῆς πρεσβύτιδος Ῥώμης θεοφιλεστάτῳ ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ φυλάττεσθαι· χρῆναι δὲ τὸν ὁσιώτατον ἀρχιεπίσκοπον τῆς βασιλίδος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, νέας Ῥώμης, τῶν αὐτῶν πρεσβείων τῆς τιμῆς ἀπολαύειν.—It. Act. 4. (ibid. p. 472 c.) Συνᾴδει ἡ ἐπιστολὴ τοῦ ὁσιωτάτου καὶ θεοφιλεστάτου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Λέοντος τῷ συμβόλῳ τῷ ἐν Νικαίᾳ τριακοσίων δέκα ὀκτὼ ἁγίων πατέρων ἡμῶν.—It. c. 30. ibid. p. 771 b.) Ἄχρι τῆς χειροτονίας τοῦ ἐσομένου τῆς τῶν Ἀλεξανδρέων μεγαλοπόλεως ἀρχιεπισκόποι κ. τ. λ.

[11] In Act. 14. C. Chalced. (ibid.

Council at Constantinople[12], Theodore, bishop of Ephesus, subscribes himself both 'metropolitan of Ephesus, and exarch of the Asiatic diocese:' as also Philalethes, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, styles himself exarch of the Pontic diocese. Which shows, that as the exarch of a province is a metropolitan, so the exarch of a diocese is a patriarch in the ancient language of the Church. And by this we understand the meaning of the ninth and seventeenth canons of the Council of Chalcedon, which allow of appeals from the metropolitan to the exarch of the diocese.

Salmasius mistaken about first use of the name *patriarch*.

3. As to the name *patriarch*, there is some dispute among learned men when first it began to be used as an appropriate title of any Christian bishops. Salmasius[13] and some others are of opinion, that the bishop of Alexandria had this title from the time of the emperor Hadrian, which was in the beginning of the second century. Their reason is, because that emperor, in an Epistle mentioned by Vopiscus, speaks of a patriarch at Alexandria. But the patriarch there spoken of was not any Christian, but a Jewish patriarch; as may appear from Hadrian's words[14], and the character which he gives of him. For he says, 'he was one who was compelled to worship both Christ and Serapis:' which agrees very well to the character of a Jewish patriarch, who neither acknowledged the heathen nor the Christian religion, and therefore needed as much compulsion to bring him to worship Christ as Serapis: but it does not at all agree to the character of a Christian bishop, who, however he might need force to compel him to worship Serapis, yet must be supposed willing of his own accord to

p. 746 d.) Διὰ τοῦτο πάλιν ὑπό τε τοῦ ἐξάρχου τῆς ἀνατολικῆς διοικήσεως κληθεὶς, κ. τ. λ.

[12] Act. 18. (t. 6. p. 1079 a.) Θεόδωρος, ἐλέῳ Θεοῦ ἐπίσκοπος τῆς Ἐφεσίων μητροπόλεως, καὶ ἔξαρχος τῆς Ἀσιανῶν διοικήσεως, ὑπὲρ ἐμαυτοῦ καὶ τῆς ὑπ' ἐμὲ συνόδου ὁμοίως ὑπεσημηνάμην.

[13] De Primat. c. 4. (p. 43.) Si quis patriarcha tum vocatus est, ut de episcopo Alexandrino constat, quem Hadriani imperatoris ævo sic appellatum epistola ejus ostendit in Saturnini Vita a Flavio Vopisco posita, non eam per illud tempus habuisse significationem certum est, quam habuit postea.—Cf. Salmas. annot. in Vopisc. (p. 960. n. 4.) Inaudiverat aliquid, &c.

[14] Ap. Vopisc. Vit. Saturn. (int. August. Hist. Scriptor. p. 959.) Illi, qui Serapin colunt, Christiani sunt; et devoti sunt Serapi, qui se Christi episcopos dicunt. Nemo illic archisynagogus Judæorum, nemo Samarites, nemo Christianorum presbyter, non mathematicus, non aruspex, non aliptes. Ipse ille patriarcha, quum Ægyptum venerit, ab aliis Serapidem adorare, ab aliis cogitur Christum.

worship Christ. Besides, the patriarch, which the emperor speaks of, was one who came only occasionally into Egypt out of another country; which cannot be said of the bishop of Alexandria, who had his fixed and continual residence there: but it suits exactly the state and condition of the Jewish patriarch, who resided at Tiberias, in Palestine, and came but accidentally, or at some certain times, into Egypt. These and the like reasons make others conclude against Salmasius, that, whoever is meant, it is not any Christian patriarch that is here spoken of. Baronius[15] fancies it was the heathen *pontifex* or high-priest of Egypt. But the same reasons will hold against his opinion as against the other; for the high-priest of Egypt lived in Egypt, and needed no compulsion to worship Serapis, as this patriarch did: so that it must be the Jewish patriarch, and no other, which Hadrian speaks of, as Mr. Basnage[16] and Bishop Pearson[17], with some others[18], have observed.

[15] An. 112. n. 2. (t. 2. p. 50 b.) Nomen [patriarcha] antiquissimum est, tum a Judæis, tum etiam a Gentilibus usurpatum; quod, sicut alia multa, in Ecclesiam feliciter transiit: non tantum enim Judæi, sed et Ægyptii utebantur eo nomine atque primaria dignitate: nam Herodotus, cum agit de sacris Ægyptiorum, patriarchas illos nominat, qui principem locum in sacris tenent. Insuper usus est eo nomine Adrianus imperator, Trajani successor, in epistola ad Servianum consulem, etc.

[16] Exercit. in Baron. an. 39. p. 284. 'An ad patriarchas Judæos necne referendum sit Adriani rescriptum, in quæstione positum est. Magnus ille Salmasius, 'Eu,' inquit, '*episcopum Alexandrinum Adriani temporibus patriarcham appellatum. Non igitur tam recens est patriarchæ nomen in Ecclesia Christiana, quam quidem videri volunt, quibus placet, nec Nicæni temporis ætate, tanto post Adrianum interrallo, usitatum illud inter Christianos fuisse pro eo, qui toti diœcesi præerat, et diœceseos exarchus dicebatur:*' quæ viri eruditissimi hunc in locum adnotatio Verum, pace cinerum ejus, in simum errorem lapsus est. Non Alexandrinum episcopum, sed Judæorum patriarcham designabat Adrianus, verbis adeo propriis et significantibus, ut mirum sit clar. Salmasium ibi Christianum episcopum vidisse, &c.

[17] Vindic. Ignat. part 1. c. 11. (ap. Cotel. v. 2. p. 328.) Miror itaque cuiquam in mentem venire potuisse hæc de episcopo Alexandrino dicta fuisse; quasi ille Ægyptum aliquando tantum peteret, et cum ibi esset Christum colere cogeretur: præsertim cum utrumque Judæorum patriarchæ, ea ætate notissimo, tam probe conveniat. Judæorum patriarcham intelligo, qui in Palæstina vivebat, non qui Alexandriæ constitutus fuit, ut putabant Petitus et Petrus a Marca, &c.

[18] Suicer. Thes. Eccles. voce Πατριάρχης (t. 2. p. 640.) Hæc [verba Imp. Adriani] non possunt intelligi neque de episcopo Alexandrino, qui non necesse habuisset in Ægyptum venire, utpote qui in ea suam habebat sedem; nec de ullo Christiano, qui ad adorandum Christum nulla vi fuisset adigendus, utpote gnarus ipsum Christiani nomen hoc a se flagitare: sed referri debent ad patriarcham Judæorum Tiberiade habitantem, qui ex æquo hostis erat

4. These Jewish patriarchs, from whom, as it is generally agreed, the Christian patriarchs borrowed their names, were *a sort of governors among the Jews*, set up upon the destruction of Jerusalem; one of which had his residence at Tiberias, and another at Babylon, who were the heads of the Jews, dispersed throughout the Roman and the Persian empire. Of these there is frequent mention made in the ancient writers of the Church, Origen[19], Epiphanius[20], Cyril of Jerusalem[21], Theodoret[22], and many others. They continued in great power and dignity till the latter end of the fourth century, about which time their order ceased. For Theodoret says expressly, that long before this time their government was wholly abolished; and one of the laws of the younger Theodosius[23], anno 429, speaks of them as then extinct.

Of the Jewish patriarchs, their rise, continuation, extinction.

5. Much about the same time the Montanists, or Cataphrygian heretics, had an order of men among them which they called *patriarchs*, and another which they called *cenones*; both which were superior to their bishops, and, as it should seem, distinct orders from them. For St. Jerom[24] charges it on them as a crime, that they thrust down the order of bishops, who

Of the patriarchs among the Montanists.

et eorum qui Christum et qui Serapidem adorabant.—Cave, Anc. Ch. Gov. p. 153. (See ch. 4. s. 3. p. 408.) That the title of patriarch, &c.

[19] Περὶ Ἀρχῶν. l. 4. c. 1. Ruffin. Interpret. (t. 1. p. 159. n. 3.) ..... Dicunt permanere adhuc principem ex genere Judæ, istum videlicet, qui est gentis eorum princeps, quem nominant patriarcham.

[20] Hær. 30. Ebion. n. 4. (t. 1. p. 128 b.) Ὁ δὲ πατριάρχης κατ' ἐκεῖνο καιροῦ Ἑλληλ τοὔνομα ἦν .. ἐκ γένους δὲ Γαμαλιὴλ ἐτύγχανε, τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῖς γενομένου πατριάρχου.—[Vide etiam ap. nn. 6, 7, 11. Ed.]

[21] Catech. 12. n. 7. [al. 17.] (p. 171 c.) Εἰ ἔχουσι τὸν ἐκ γένους Ἰούδα, καὶ τοῦ Δαβὶδ, οὔπω ἦλθεν ὁ προσδοκώμενος· αἰσχύνομαι γὰρ λέγειν αὐτῶν τὰ πρόσφατα περὶ τῶν καλουμένων παρ' αὐτοῖς νῦν πατριαρχῶν πράγματα.

[22] Dial. 1. (t. 4. part. 1. p. 32.) ΕΡΑΝ. Οἱ καλούμενοι οὖν τῶν Ἰουδαίων πατριάρχαι, οὐκ ἐκ τῆς Δαυϊδικῆς ὑπάρχουσι συγγενείας; ΟΡΘ. Οὐδαμῶς. ΕΡΑΝ. Ἀλλὰ πόθεν ὁρμῶνται; ΟΡΘ. Ἐξ Ἡρώδου τοῦ ἀλλοφύλου, ὃς πατρόθεν μὲν Ἀσκαλωνίτης ἐτύγχανεν ὤν, μητρόθεν δὲ Ἰδουμαῖος· ἄλλως τε καὶ αὐτοὶ παντελῶς ἠφανίσθησαν, καὶ χρόνος διελήλυθεν, ἐξ οὗ καὶ ἡ τούτων ἡγεμονία τὸ πέρας ἐδέξατο.

[23] Cod. Theod. l. 16. tit. 8. de Jud. leg. 29. (t. 6. p. 245.) Judæorum primates, qui in utriusque Palæstinæ synedriis nominantur, vel in aliis provinciis degunt, quæcunque, post excessum patriarcharum, pensionis nomine suscepere, cogantur exsolvere.

[24] Ep. 54. [al. 41.] ad Marcel. adv. Montan. t. 2. p. 128. (t. 1. p. 187 b.) Apud nos Apostolorum locum episcopi tenent: apud eos episcopus tertius est. Habent enim primos de Pepuza Phrygiæ patriarchas: secundos quos appellant cenones: atque ita in tertium, id est, pene ultimum locum, episcopi devolvuntur.

were the Apostles' successors, and set up an order of *patriarchs* and an order of *cenones* among them: which makes some learned men[25] think, that, when St. Jerom wrote that against the Montanists, the name *patriarch* was not as yet adopted into the Church, though the power was under another name.

name patriarch used first by Socrates, in the Council of Chalcedon.

6. Indeed, the first time we meet with the name *patriarch* given to any bishop, by any public authority of the Church, is in the Council of Chalcedon, which mentions[26] 'the most holy patriarchs of every diocese,' and particularly Leo 'patriarch of great Rome[27].' Richerius[28], who has written accurately about the Councils, can trace the name no higher. Among private authors, the first that mentions patriarchs by name is Socrates, who wrote his history about the year 440, eleven years before the Council of Chalcedon. By what he says, it appears that during the interval between the general Council of Constantinople, anno 381, and that of Chalcedon, the name *patriarch* began to be an appropriate title of some eminent bishops in the Church: for, speaking of the fathers at Constantinople, he says[29], 'they constituted patriarchs, dividing the provinces among them.' Valesius[30] and Dr. Cave[31] think Socrates speaks not of true and proper patriarchs, but only of extraordinary legates, or *pro tempore* commissioners, appointed by the Council to judge who were fit to be received to catholic communion, in the several dioceses that were allotted them. But all others understand him in the proper sense, because by

[25] Basnag. Exercit. in Baron. an. 39. (p. 285.) Hinc colligi possit, priscis temporibus nondum episcopis insignioribus affixum fuisse nomen patriarchæ.

[26] Act. 2. (t. 4. p. 338 e.) Εἰ δοκεῖ τῇ ὑμετέρᾳ εὐλαβείᾳ, οἱ ὁσιώτατοι πατριάρχαι διοικήσεως ἑκάστης ἐπιλεξάμενοι ἕνα, ἢ δεύτερον τῆς ἰδίας ἕκαστος διοικήσεως, εἰς τὸ μέσον παρελθόντες, καὶ κοινῇ περὶ τῆς πίστεως βουλευσάμενοι, τὰ συνδοκοῦντα φανερὰ πᾶσι καταστήσουσιν.

[27] Ibid. Act. 3. (p. 395 a.) Τῷ ἁγιωτάτῳ καὶ θεοφιλεστάτῳ οἰκουμενικῷ ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ καὶ πατριάρχῃ τῆς μεγάλης Ῥώμης Λέοντι, κ. τ. λ.

[28] Hist. Concil. l. 1. c. 2. n. 11. (p. 25.)...Quod nomen patriarchatus ... et patriarchæ aliquanto post Synodum Nicænam est inventum, et primum, quod sciam, usurpatum in Synodo Chalcedonensi.

[29] L. 5. c. 8. (v. 2. p. 270. 4.)... Πατριάρχας κατέστησαν, διανειμάμενοι τὰς ἐπαρχίας.

[30] In Socrat. verba τὴν πατριαρχίαν ἐκληρώσατο (ibid. p. 270. n. 4.) Intelligit Socrates non veros atque ordinarios patriarchas, sed extraordinarios legatos, qui ad stabiliendam rectam fidem per singulas diœceses fuerant destinati .... Apparet eum non de veris atque ordinariis patriarchis locutum esse.

[31] Anc. Ch. Gov. p. 147. (ch. 4. s. 2. p. 407.) Socrates giving an account of this canon, &c.

this time patriarchal power was settled in all the dioceses of the Roman empire.

7. But though the name of patriarchs came not into the Church till about the time of Socrates, yet the power itself, as is agreed on all hands, was much earlier; though where precisely to fix the epocha, and date its rise, is not so easy to determine. Some carry it as high as the Apostles, and derive it, as they do the Pope's supremacy, from St. Peter. So Baronius[32], who is followed by the most eminent writers of his own communion, De Marca, Valesius, Richerius, Pagius, and Schelstrate. Others justly reject this, as founded upon no good authority, nor evidenced by any genuine records of the ancient Church, but only the spurious epistles of the first popes; and reckon the first rise of patriarchs to have been after the apostolical age, and some time before the Council of Nice. This is the opinion of Spalatensis[33] and Mr. Brerewood[34]. The third opinion is that of Balsamon[35] and other modern Greeks, that

Fou ent con the rise tria pow

[32] An. 39. n. 16. (t. 1. p. 272 c.) Quamobrem ut a Petro peculiariter dici possit (quod tradunt omnes) fundatam esse ecclesiam Antiochenam: dicendum est, Petrum primo erexisse, seu instituisse sedem patriarchalem Antiochenam.—Cf. De Marc. de Concord. l. 1. c. 3. n. 5. (p. 14.) Verum etsi forma dividendarum provinciarum et metropoleon ab Apostolis manaverit, hæc tamen divisio ab episcopis, qui erant in majoribus urbibus constituti, per incrementa variorum temporum aucta, tandem ultimam dispositionem consecuta est, &c.—Ibid. [p. 15.] Sane dissimulandum non est, eo canone [Nicæno] tres illos antistites episcoporum [Romanum, Alexandrinum, et Antiochenum] tantum vel ad summum metropolitanorum nomine censeri: qui, sæculo sequente, in Concilio Ephesino archiepiscoporum titulo aucti, in Concilio Constantinopolitano exarchorum diœceseos dignitate decorati, tandem in Concilio Chalcedonensi promiscue archiepiscopi, exarchi, et novitia dictione patriarchæ sunt appellati.—Vales. Observ. Eccles. l. 3. tot. (v. 2. p. 394.)—Richer. Hist. Concil. l. 1. c. 2. n. 14. (p. 29.) Magna quidem pugnatur contentione, &c. —Pagi, Crit. in Baron. an. 37. n. 9. (t. 1. p. 31.) Porro in tribus majoribus imperii civitatibus institutæ sunt tres potissimæ dignitates ecclesiæ, et præcipuæ sedes patriarchicæ. Nicænum Concilium antiquam consuetudinem ab Apostolis ortam servari mandavit, canone 6, *Antiqua consuetudo servetur, &c.:* ubi trium sedium patriarchalium in præcipuis Imperii urbibus auctoritas firmatur, quam Leo I. Epist. 53. ad Anatolium instituto Apostolorum principis Petri adscribit, et stabilem permanere præcipit.

[33] De Republ. Eccles. part. 1. l. 3. c. 12. n. 21. (t. 1. p. 511 d. 3.) Quid, quæso, canoni sexto Nicæno edicendo occasionem dedit, nisi patriarcharum isthæc ambitio, eorumque de primatu controversiæ et dissentiones? Quibus ita occurrit, ut singuli propriis limitibus coercerentur, nec unus in alterius regimen se inveheret, &c.

[34] Of Patriarchal Government, Q. 1. (Brief Treatises, &c. pp. 96, seqq.) *Whether every church or bishop at the time of the Nicene Council were subject to the patriarchs, &c.*

[35] In c. 6. C. Nicæn. (p. 286 a.) Ὁ

patriarchs were first instituted by the Council of Nice. And this seems to be favoured by St. Jerom: for in his Epistle to Pammachius, writing against the errors of John of Jerusalem, he says[36], 'it was decreed in the Council of Nice that Cæsarea should be the metropolis of Palestine, and Antioch the metropolis of the whole East; therefore, the bishop of Jerusalem must either appeal to the bishop of Cæsarea, as his immediate metropolitan, or to the bishop of Antioch, as metropolitan of the East.' But if I rightly understand St. Jerom, he does not mean, as some mistake him, that patriarchs were first set up by the Council of Nice; for then metropolitans must be so too; since he says the same of them, which yet every one knows were in the Church long before the Council of Nice. His meaning then must be, that both metropolitans of provinces and metropolitans of dioceses were in being before the Council of Nice, and only received confirmation, or a canonical establishment, from it. And indeed it is evident that the Nicene fathers made no alteration in these matters, but only confirmed the ancient rights of the bishops of principal cities, as they found them authorized by custom before. For the words they use are[37], Τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω, *Let ancient custom still take place;* so as in Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, the bishop of Alexandria shall have power over all; because such also is the custom of the bishop of Rome: and accordingly in Antioch, and in other provinces, let the privileges be preserved to the churches.'

Here it is plain that no new power is given to any bishops, but only what ancient custom and practice had assigned them. So that either patriarchs were set up by custom, before the

παρὼν κανὼν καὶ ὁ δ' διορίζονται τοὺς δὲ πατριάρχας, δηλαδὴ τὸν Ῥώμης, τὸν Ἀλεξανδρείας, τὸν Ἀντιοχείας, καὶ τὸν Ἱεροσολύμων, (περὶ γὰρ τοῦ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐν ἑτέροις κανόσι διαληφθήσεται) καὶ τὰ παλαιὰ ἔθη τιμᾶσθαι, κ. τ. λ.

[36] Ep. 61. t. 2. p. 178. [al. Lib. cont. Joan. Hierosol.] (t. 2. p. 447 b.) . . Ad Alexandrinum episcopum Palæstina quid pertinet? Ni fallor, hoc ibi decernitur, ut Palæstinæ metropolis Cæsarea sit, et totius Orientis Antiochia. Aut igitur ad Cæsariensem episcopum referre debueras ;. . . . . Aut, si procul expetendum judicium erat, Antiochiam potius literæ dirigendæ.

[37] C. 6. (t. 2. p. 32 c.) Τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω, τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ Λιβύῃ καὶ Πενταπόλει, ὥστε τὸν Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπίσκοπον πάντων τούτων ἔχειν τὴν ἐξουσίαν· ἐπειδὴ καὶ τῷ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπισκόπῳ τοῦτο συνηθές ἐστιν· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν, καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἐπαρχίαις, τὰ πρεσβεῖα σώζεσθαι ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις.

uncil of Nice[38], and confirmed by the Council, as St. Jerom nks, or else not introduced till afterwards. This last opinion, withstanding what St. Jerom says, is embraced by the fa- us Mr. Launoy[39], Mr. Basnage[40], Dr. Beveridge[41], and Dr. ve[42], who think that patriarchal power was not confirmed the Nicene canon, nor known in the Church till about the e of the second general Council of Constantinople, anno 381.

3. In a matter so obscure, and so variously controverted ong learned men, it is not easy to determine where the ht lies. Patriarchal power was not set up at one and the ne time in all places. Alexandria and Antioch were as early any, and the bishop of Alexandria, before the Council of ce, had all Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis under his jurisdic- n, as appears from the Nicene canons. This was the *Diœ- is Ægyptiaca*, which consisted of six large provinces, four Egypt, viz. Thebais, Arcadia, Augustanica, and Ægyptus perly so called, Libya Inferior, and Libya Superior, which Pentapolis. As all these were subject to the *Præfectus Au- stalis* of Egypt, so they were likewise under the jurisdiction the bishop of Alexandria. So that he was not only a metro- litan of a single province, but of six provinces joined in one cese. But now the question is, whether, at this time, he had y metropolitans under him? For if he had, then he was

The opinion of Spalatensis and St. Jerom preferred.

[38] So Du Pin, Biblioth. v.1. p. 252. 2. p. 316.) Il [le sixième canon] eserve aux grands sieges leurs iens privileges; c'est-à-dire, la isdiction ou l'autorité qu'ils a- ent sur plusieurs provinces, qu'on epuis appellée jurisdiction de pa- rche ou d'exarque, &c.—Id. de tiq. Eccles. Discipl. dissert. 1. 1. (p. 35.) De his loquitur Con- um Nicænum c. 6. . . . . cum sta- t ut Alexandrinus præsul habeat, .

[39] De Rect. Interpret. c. 6. C. Ni- n. (Oper. t. 4. pp. 3, seqq.) See last part of ch. 1.

[40] Exercit. in Baron. an. 39. (p. 7.) Habet aliquid quæstionis, an patriarchale a patribus Nicænis rit agnitum? Hoc velint Petrus Marca, Valesius, Antonius Pagi, helstratus, immo ipse Beveregius: am longissime, nostro judicio, abhorrentem a vero opinionem sequentibus argumentis impugnamus, &c.

[41] Not. in c. 2. C. Constant. (t. 2. append. p. 95.) Balsamon ex præsenti canone recte hic observat, omnes provinciarum metropolitanos olim, et hujus Concilii temporibus, αὐτοκέφαλους, sui juris, et per se suarum provinciarum capita, et nulli proin alii tanquam capiti subjectos. Hoc autem posito et concesso, quid fiet de illius aliorumque opinione contendentium, patriarchas etiam a Concilio Nicæno constitutos esse? Si omnes enim metropolitani fuerint αὐτοκέφαλοι, et a suis synodis ordinati, omnis patriarcharum potestas evanescit; et sic quidem se res habuit non modo Synodi Nicænæ, sed et præsentis diebus, &c.

[42] Anc. Ch. Gov. ch. 2. and 4. (pp. 377, 405.)

properly a patriarch at the time of the Nicene Council. As to this, I can only say that Epiphanius and Synesius do expressly mention archbishops and metropolitans under the archbishop of Alexandria, in the time of Athanasius and Alexander his predecessor, who were both present in the Council of Nice. But whether they mean metropolitans in the proper sense, or only coadjutors to the archbishop of Alexandria, I cannot yet determine. I will recite the passages, and leave the curious and the learned to make further inquiry. Synesius says[43], 'the great Athanasius seeing the Church of Ptolemais had need of a bishop that was able to cherish and augment the small sparks of true religion, which was then in a dwindling condition there, and finding Siderius, bishop of Palæbisca, a man fit for great business, he commanded him to remove thence to Ptolemais, to govern the metropolitical church there.' And Epiphanius, speaking of Meletius, the author of the Meletian schism, before the Council of Nice, says expressly[44], 'he was an archbishop in Egypt, under Alexander, archbishop of Alexandria, to whom he gave the first information against Arius.' This agrees with what he says of him in another place[45], 'that he was chief of the Egyptian bishops, and next in order to Peter in the archbishoprie, being his assistant, and administering ecclesiastical affairs under him. For there the custom is for the archbishop of Alexandria to have the ordering of ecclesiastical matters throughout all Egypt, Thebais, Marcotes, Libya, Ammoniaca, Marcotis, and Pentapolis.' So that, as the bishop of Alexandria had six provinces under him, he seems also to have had subordinate metropolitans, or archbishops, under him likewise, as the archbishop of Lycopolis in Thebais, [and] the metropolitan of Ptolemais in Pentapolis. And if these

[43] Ep. 67. ad Theoph. p. 231. (p. 210 b. 6.) . . . . Παμμεγαν Ἀθανασιον, ... τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον, ὡς μείζοσι πραγμασιν ἐπιτήδειον, ἐκεῖ διαβῆναι κελεύσαι, τὴν μητροπολίτιν ἐκκλησιαν ἐπιτροπεύσοντα.

[44] Hær. 66. Arian. n. 3. (t. 1. p. 720 c.) Ἀνηνεγκε τοιγαρ εἰς τὰ ὦτα τοῦ ἀρχιεπισκοπου Ἀλεξανδρου ὁ ἀρχιεπισκοπος Μελήτιος ὁ κατὰ τὴν Αἴγυπτον, ὑπὸ δε χειρα Ἀλεξανδρου εδόκει εἶναι.

[45] Hær. 68. Meletian. n. 1. (ibid. p. 717 b.) Ἐδόκει δὲ καὶ ὁ Μελήτιος τῶν κατὰ τὴν Αἴγυπτον προήκων, καὶ δευτερεύων τῷ Πετρῳ κατὰ τὴν ἀρχιεπισκοπὴν, ὡς δι' ἀντιλήψεως αὐτοῦ χαριν, ὑπ' αὐτὸν δὲ ὢν. καὶ ὑπ' αὐτὸν τὰ ἐκκλησιαστικὰ ἀναφέρων· τοῦτο γὰρ ἔθος ἐστὶ, τὸν ἐν τῇ Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ἀρχιεπίσκοπον πάσης τε Αἰγύπτου καὶ Θηβαΐδος, Μαραιώτου τε, καὶ Λιβύης, Ἀμμωνιακῆς, Μαραιωτιδός τε καὶ Πεντα πολεως, ἔχειν τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν διοικησιν.

were properly metropolitans, he must be a patriarch, under the name of metropolitan of the whole Egyptian diocese, as they were metropolitans of their respective provinces: which is the thing that St. Jerom asserts in reference to Cæsarea and Antioch, 'that the one was the metropolis of Palestine and the other the metropolis of the Oriental diocese; and this, from ancient custom, ratified and confirmed by the Council of Nice.'

Patri
powe
blish
three
neral
cils s
sively
Cons
nople
Ephe
and (
cedon

9. But however this be, for I determine nothing positively in this matter, the next age affords us very pregnant proofs of the establishment and growth of patriarchal power. The general Council of Constantinople, anno 381, has a canon[46] to fix the limits of the several dioceses: so that the bishop of Alexandria should only administer the affairs of the Egyptian diocese; the bishops of the East, the eastern diocese, reserving the privileges granted by the Council of Nice to the Church of Antioch; the bishops of the Asiatic diocese, the Asiatic Churches only; those of the Pontic diocese, the Pontic Churches; and those of the Thracian diocese, the Thracian Churches only.

Theodoret[47], speaking of this Council, says, 'they divided the dioceses, and assigned every diocese its proper limits and jurisdiction.' And Socrates[48], more expressly, 'that they constituted patriarchs, and distributed the provinces, so that no bishops should meddle with the affairs of another diocese, as was used to be done in times of persecution. Nectarius was allotted Constantinople and Thrace; Helladius, St. Basil's successor, the Pontic diocese, &c.'

About fifty years after this, anno 431, the third general Council was held at Ephesus, where we find the bishop of An-

[46] C. 11. (t. 2. p. 947 a.) *Τοὺς ὑπὲρ διοίκησιν ἐπισκόπους, ταῖς ὑπερορίοις ἐκκλησίαις μὴ ἐπιέναι, μηδὲ συγχέειν τὰς ἐκκλησίας· ἀλλὰ κατὰ τοὺς κανόνας, τὸν μὲν Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπίσκοπον τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ μόνον οἰκονομεῖν· τοὺς δὲ τῆς Ἀνατολῆς ἐπισκόπους τὴν Ἀνατολὴν μόνην διοικεῖν· φυλαττομένων τῶν ἐν τοῖς κανόσι τοῖς κατὰ Νίκαιαν πρεσβείων τῇ Ἀντιοχέων ἐκκλησίᾳ· καὶ τοὺς τῆς Ἀσιανῆς διοικήσεως ἐπισκόπους τὰ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν μόνην οἰκονομεῖν· καὶ τοὺς τῆς Ποντικῆς, τὰ τῆς Ποντικῆς μόνον· καὶ τοὺς τῆς Θρᾴκης, τὰ τῆς Θρᾳκικῆς μόνον οἰκονομεῖν.*

[47] Ep. 86. ad Flavian. t. 3. p. 960. (t. 4. part. 3. p. 1157.) .... *Τὰς διοικήσεις διέκριναν, καὶ ἑκάστῃ διοικήσει τὰ ἑαυτῆς ἀπένειμαν, ἀντικρὺς ἀπαγορεύσαντες, ἐξ ἑκατέρας τινὰς διοικήσεως ἑτέρᾳ μὴ ἐπιέναι.*

[48] L. 5. c. 8. (v. 2. p. 270. 4.) *Καὶ πατριάρχας καθέστησαν, διανειμάμενοι τὰς ἐπαρχίας, ὥστε τοὺς ὑπὲρ διοίκησιν ἐπισκόπους ταῖς ὑπερορίοις ἐκκλησίαις μὴ ὑπερβαίνειν· τοῦτο γὰρ πρότερον διὰ τοὺς διωγμοὺς ἐγίνετο ἀδιαφόρως· καὶ κληροῦται Νεκτάριος μὲν τὴν Μεγαλόπολιν καὶ τὴν Θρᾴκην· τῆς δὲ Ποντικῆς διοικήσεως, Ἑλλάδιος, ὁ μετὰ Βασίλειον Καισαρείας τῆς Καππαδοκῶν ἐπίσκοπος.*

tioch laying claim to the power of ordinations in the province of Cyprus: but this proving to be an unjust claim, the Council made a decree in favour of the Cyprian bishops, exempting them from the jurisdiction of Antioch, because by ancient custom they always were exempt: and it is added [49], 'that the same rule should be observed in all dioceses and provinces, that no bishop should seize upon any province which did not anciently belong to his jurisdiction.' This plainly implies, that the bishop of Antioch had then several provinces, or a whole diocese, under his power: which was confirmed to him by the Council, and he was only denied jurisdiction over the province of Cyprus, because of ancient right it did not belong to him.

About eighteen years after this, Theodosius Junior and Valentinian called the second Council of Ephesus, anno 449: and in the letter of summons to Dioscorus, bishop of Alexandria, they give him orders to bring ten metropolitans of his diocese with him. This is noted by Liberatus in his Breviary [50], and the letter is still extant in the Council of Chalcedon [51]: by which it appears that at this time the archbishop of Alexandria had a great number of metropolitans within the Egyptian diocese under his jurisdiction. So that though there be some dispute concerning the first rise and original of patriarchal power, yet there remains no manner of doubt but that it was come to its full height and establishment in the time of the general Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon.

10. Therefore the next inquiry is into *the rights and privileges* of these patriarchs. And here it is to be nicely observed, that the power of patriarchs was not one and the same precisely in all Churches, but differed according to the different

[49] C. Ephes. 1. Act. 7. Decret. de Episc. Cypr. t. 3. p. 802 c. Ἔξουσι τὸ ἀνεπηρέαστον καὶ ἀδίαστον οἱ τῶν ἁγίων ἐκκλησιῶν τῶν κατὰ τὴν Κύπρον πρωεστῶτες, κατὰ τοὺς κανόνας τῶν ὁσίων πατέρων καὶ τὴν ἀρχαίαν συνήθειαν, δι' ἑαυτῶν τὰς χειροτονίας τῶν εὐλαβεστάτων ἐπισκόπων ποιούμενοι· τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων διοικήσεων καὶ τῶν ἁπανταχοῦ ἐπαρχιῶν παραφυλαχθήσεται· ὥστε μηδένα τῶν θεοφιλεστάτων ἐπισκόπων ἐπαρχίαν ἑτέραν, οὐκ οὖσαν ἄνωθεν καὶ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὑπὸ τὴν αὐτοῦ, ἤγουν τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ χεῖρα, καταλαμβάνειν.

[50] Cap. 12. (CC. t. 5. p. 757 e.) .... Imperator dirigens Sacram Dioscoro in Alexandriam, præcepit, ut cum decem metropolitanis episcopis, quos voluisset, ipse eligeret, et veniret Ephesum.

[51] Act. 1. (t. 4. p. 100 c.) Καὶ ἡ σὴ .... ὁσιότης προσλαβοῦσα σὺν ἑαυτῇ δέκα μὲν εὐλαβεστάτους ἐπισκόπους τῶν ὑπὸ τὴν αὐτὴν διοίκησιν, μητροπολίτας, κ. τ. λ.

customs of places and countries, or according as it was the pleasure of kings or councils to bestow greater privileges on them.

The patriarch of Constantinople, when he was first advanced by the second general Council, had only the single diocese of Thrace assigned him[52] for the exercise of his jurisdiction; but in the next age he was grown to be a sort of patriarch over the patriarchs of Ephesus and Cæsarea in the Asiatic and Pontic dioceses, by the voluntary consent of those two exarchs, no doubt, at first, paying a deference to the exarch of the royal city; which, advancing into a custom, was afterwards confirmed by canon in the Council of Chalcedon. In the sixteenth session of that Council there is a long debate about this matter, the Pope's legates warmly stickling against it. But all the metropolitans of the two dioceses of Asia and Pontus then in council, together with Thalasius bishop of Cæsarea and exarch of the Pontic diocese, with one voice declaring, 'that the bishop of Constantinople had by long custom and prescription enjoyed the privilege of ordaining metropolitans in those two dioceses, as well as that of Thrace,' it was decreed that this privilege should be continued to him, notwithstanding the bishop of Rome's intercession against it[53]. Also by two canons of that Council he is allowed to receive appeals[54] from the exarchs of those dioceses, because his throne was in the royal city; and in such parts of those dioceses as were chiefly in the hands of barbarians, he is authorized by another canon[55] to

The patriarch Constantinople somewhat peculiar privileges

[52] Vid. C. Constant. 1. c. 2. (t. 2. p. 947 b.) ... *Τοὺς τῆς Θρᾴκης τὰ τῆς Θρᾳκικῆς μόνον οἰκονομεῖν.*

[53] C. Chalced. c. 28. Ed. Crabb. *Χρῆναι δὲ τὸν ὁσιώτατον ἀρχιεπίσκοπον τῆς βασιλίδος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, νέας Ῥώμης, τῶν αὐτῶν πρεσβείων τῆς τιμῆς ἀπολαύειν, καὶ αὐτὸν ἐξ αὐθεντίας ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν τοῦ χειροτονεῖν τοὺς μητροπολίτας ἔν τε τῇ Ἀσιανῇ, καὶ Ποντικῇ, καὶ Θρᾳκικῇ ταῖς διοικήσεσι, κ. τ. λ.*—[Worded differently in Labbe. See Observat. Editor. Roman. (t. 4. p. 767 ad calc.) Canones qui sequuntur [28, 29, 30,] non extant in codicibus Græcis manuscriptis, quos habuimus hujus Concilii, &c.—Ibid. Act. 16. q. tot. v. (pp. 791 e. seqq.) See particularly the passage, (p. 795 d.) *Πανταχοῦ, κ. τ. λ.* Ed.]

[54] Ibid. c. 9. (p. 759 d.) *Εἰ δὲ πρὸς τὸν τῆς αὐτῆς ἐπαρχίας μητροπολίτην ἐπίσκοπος ἢ κληρικὸς ἀμφισβητοίη, καταλαμβανέτω ἢ τὸν ἔξαρχον τῆς διοικήσεως, ἢ τὸν τῆς βασιλευούσης Κωνσταντινουπόλεως θρόνον, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῷ δικαζέσθω.*—It. c. 17. (p. 763 c.) *Εἰ δέ τις παρὰ τοῦ ἰδίου ἀδικοῖτο μητροπολίτου, παρὰ τῷ ἐπάρχῳ τῆς διοικήσεως ἢ τῷ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως θρόνῳ, δικαζέσθω, καθὰ προείρηται.*

[55] Ibid. c. 28. (p. 798 a.) *Τοὺς ἐν τοῖς βαρβαρικοῖς ἐπισκόπους τῶν προειρημένων διοικήσεων χειροτονεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ προειρημένου ἁγιωτάτου θρόνου τῆς κατὰ Κωνσταντινούπολιν ἁγιωτάτης ἐκκλησίας, κ. τ. λ.*

ordain all the bishops, which in other parts was the sole privilege of the metropolitans. Theodoret[56] observes even of Chrysostom himself, before the Council of Chalcedon, that he exercised this power over all the three dioceses: for he says, 'his care extended not only over Constantinople and Thrace, which consisted of six provinces, but over Asia and Pontus, each of which had eleven civil prætors in them.' We are not therefore to take an estimate of patriarchal power from the growing greatness of Constantinople, but to distinguish the peculiar privileges of some patriarchs above others, which is the only way to understand the power of each.

11. For the patriarch of Alexandria had also some prerogatives which no other patriarch besides himself enjoyed. Such was the right of consecrating and approving every single bishop throughout all the provinces of his diocese. This privilege was not allowed even to the patriarch of Constantinople: for the Council of Chalcedon[57], in the very same place where they give him power to consecrate the metropolitans of three whole dioceses, deny him the privilege of consecrating the suffragan bishops of those metropolitans, and reserve it as an ancient right of each metropolitan, with a synod of his provincial bishops, to consecrate all the bishops within his province, the archbishops of Constantinople neither being consulted, nor having any hand in those ordinations. But it was otherwise at Alexandria. For the bishop of Alexandria, whilst he was only a metropolitan, had the ordination of all the bishops of the six provinces of the Egyptian diocese, being the sole and only metropolitan in all those provinces; and, having but the same diocese when he came to be a patriarch, he continued his ancient custom of ordaining all the bishops throughout the six provinces, notwithstanding that new metropolitans were set up in them. And in this the patriarch of Alexandria differed from

[56] L. 5. c. 28. (v. 3. p. 230. 16.)... *Ταύτην ἐποιεῖτο τὴν προμήθειαν, οὐ μόνης ἐκείνης τῆς πόλεως, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς Θρᾴκης ἁπάσης· εἰς ἓξ δὲ αὕτη ἡγεμονίας διῄρηται· καὶ τῆς Ἀσίας ὅλης, ὑπὸ ἕνδεκα δὲ καὶ αὕτη ἀρχόντων ἰθύνεται· καὶ μέν τοι καὶ τὴν Ποντικὴν τοιτοις κατεκόσμει τοῖς νόμοις· ἰσαρίθμους δὲ καὶ αὕτη ἔχει τῆς Ἀσίας τοὺς ἡγουμένους.*

[57] Act. 16. (t. 4. p. 818 c.) *Τοὺς μέν τοι κατὰ πόλιν ὁσιωτάτους ἐπισκόπους χειροτονεῖσθαι παρὰ πάντων, ἢ τῶν πλειόνων τῆς ἐπαρχίας εὐλαβεστάτων ἐπισκόπων, τὸ κῦρος ἔχοντος τοῦ μητροπολίτου, κατὰ τὸν κείμενον τῶν πατέρων κανόνα, καὶ μηθὲν ἐπικοινωνοῦντος ταῖς ἐκείνων χειροτονίαις τοῦ ὁσιωτάτου ἀρχιεπισκόπου τῆς βασιλίδος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως.*

all others: for in all other dioceses the metropolitans had the right of ordaining their suffragan bishops, which here the patriarch retained to himself, as an ancient branch of his metropolitan power. I know, indeed, a very learned person[58] in of a different opinion: he says, 'the bishop of Alexandria was rather a loser by being made a patriarch; for now according to the constitution of church-policy, the ordination of suffragan bishops, which before belonged entirely to him, was devolved upon the several metropolitans under him.' But this assertion proceeds upon a supposition that patriarchal rights were exactly the same in all places, which, from the instance I have given of Constantinople, appears to be otherwise; for the patriarchs of Ephesus and Cæsarea had not the ordination of their own metropolitans, but they were all subject to the bishop of Constantinople. And as to the case of Alexandria, it appears from Synesius, who was himself metropolitan of Ptolemais, that the ordination not only of the metropolitans, but of all the suffragan bishops throughout the whole district of Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, belonged still to the patriarch of Alexandria. For in a letter to Theophilus, acquainting him how he and two other bishops had met at Olbiæ to make choice of a bishop, and that one Antonius was unanimously chosen by the people, he adds[59] 'that yet there was one thing wanting, which was more necessary than all, viz. his sacred hand to consecrate him.' Which shows that the bishop of Alexandria still retained his ancient right of consecrating all the bishops of the Egyptian diocese.

12. In other dioceses the patriarch's power was chiefly seen in *the ordination or confirmation of all the metropolitans that were under him.* This appears from the forecited canons of the Council of Chalcedon[60], and several of Justinian's Novels; one of which[61] takes notice of the bishop of Constantinople's ordaining all the metropolitans under him; and another[62] gives the same power to the patriarch of Justiniana Prima, then

The fir privile patriar was to dain al metrop tans of diocese receive own or tion fr

[58] Cave, Anc. Ch. Gov. ch. 4. p. 150. (s. 5. p. 411.) We begin with the patriarch of Alexandria, &c.

[59] Ep. 76. ad Theoph. (p. 223 a.) .... 'Ἑνὸς ἔτι δεῖ, τοῦ κυριοτάτου μέντοι, τῆς ἱερᾶς σου χειρός.

[60] C. 28. See n. 53, preceding.—Ibid. Act. 16. (t. 4. p. 798 a.) Χειροτονεῖσθαι .... τοὺς μητροπολίτας τῶν προειρημένων διοικήσεων παρὰ τοῦ ἀρχιεπισκόπου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως.

[61] Novel. 7. c. 1. (t. 7. p. 66.) ... Neque alias omnes ecclesias .... neque sub patriarchica sede hujus felicissimæ civitatis constitutas, quarum metropolitas ipse ordinat, &c.

[62] Novel. 131. c. 3. (t. 5. p. 583.)

diocesan synod.

newly advanced to patriarchal dignity by Justinian, because it was the place of his nativity. And that this was a peculiar privilege of patriarchs appears further from one of the Arabic Canons published by Turrian, under the name of the Nicene Canons, which were invented after the name of patriarchs was well known in the Church. The 36th of these canons, speaking of the Catholic of Ethiopia, who was no patriarch, but subject to the patriarch of Alexandria, says[63], 'he shall not have power to ordain archbishops, as patriarchs have, because he hath not the power or honour of a patriarch.'

It was therefore the prerogative of patriarchs, those of Ephesus and Cæsarea only excepted, to ordain the metropolitans under them; but they themselves were to be ordained by a diocesan synod, as Justinian's forecited Novel[64] informs us. And this was called the canonical ordination of a patriarch. For so the Council of Constantinople, in their Synodical Epistle to the Western bishops, prove the ordination of Flavian, bishop of Antioch, who presided over all the Eastern diocese, as Theodoret says[65], to be canonical; because he was ordained not only by the bishops of the province, but *τῆς Ἀνατολικῆς διοικήσεως*, by the bishops *of the whole Eastern diocese*[66] synodically met together.

second privilege, to all diocesan synods and preside in them.

13. The next privilege of patriarchs was *the power of convening* their metropolitans and all the provincial bishops to a diocesan synod; which privilege was founded upon the same canons that granted metropolitans authority to summon provincial synods, and preside in them: for by just analogy

Per tempus autem beatissimum Primæ Justinianæ nostræ patriæ archiepiscopum habere semper sub sua jurisdictione episcopos provinciarum Daciæ Mediterraneæ, et Daciæ Ripensis, et Privalis [al. Triballiæ] et Dardaniæ, et Mysiæ superioris et Pannoniæ; et ab eo hos ordinari, ipsum vero a proprio ordinari concilio.

[63] C. Nicæn. Arab. c. 36. [Version. Turrian.] (t. 2. p. 302 b.) Non tamen jus habeat constituendi archiepiscopos, ut habet patriarcha; siquidem non habet patriarchæ honorem et potestatem.

[64] See n. 62, preceding.

[65] L. 5. c. 23. (v. 3. p. 225. 41.) Καὶ τῆς Ἑῴας αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τῆς Φλαβιανοῦ προεδρίας ἀντέχονται· πρὸς δὲ τῇ Ἑῴᾳ, καὶ τὴν Ἀσιανὴν ἅπασαν καὶ Ποντικὴν, καὶ μέντοι καὶ τὴν Θρᾳκικὴν κοινωνούσας ἔχει καὶ συνημμένας· καὶ τὸ Ἰλλυρικὸν δὲ ἅπαν ἐκεῖνον οἶδε τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἀνατολὴν ἐπισκόπων ἡγούμενον.

[66] C. Constant. Ep. ad. Occident. ap. Theodor. l. 5. c. 9. (ibid. p. 206. 22.) Τῆς δὲ πρεσβυτάτης καὶ ὄντως ἀποστολικῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τῆς Συρίας, ἐν ᾗ πρώτῃ τὸ τίμιον τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἐχρημάτισεν ὄνομα, τὸν αἰδεσιμώτατον καὶ θεοφιλέστατον ἐπίσκοπον Φλαβιανὸν, οἵτε τῆς ἐπαρχίας καὶ τῆς ἀνατολικῆς διοικήσεως συνδραμόντες κανονικῶς ἐχειροτόνη-

the patriarch was to have the same power over the metropolitans that they had over their provincial bishops. And therefore Theodoret, speaking of his own attendance at the synods of his patriarch at Antioch, says[67], 'he did it in obedience to the ecclesiastical canons, which make him a criminal that is summoned to a synod and refuses to pay his attendance at it.'

A third privilege, to receive appeals from metropolitans and provincial synods.

14. Another privilege of patriarchs was *the power of receiving appeals* from metropolitans and provincial synods, and reversing their decrees if they were found faulty. 'If any bishop or clergyman have a controversy with the metropolitan of his province, let him have recourse to the exarch of the diocese,' says the Council of Chalcedon in one canon[68]; and in another[69], 'If any man is injured by his own bishop or metropolitan, let him bring his cause before the exarch of the diocese, or the throne of Constantinople.' These canons are adopted into the Civil Law, and confirmed by imperial edicts. For by one of Justinian's Constitutions[70], the patriarch is to receive appeals from a provincial synod, and give a final determination to all causes that are regularly brought before him: and the regular way of proceeding is there specified; which is, 'that no man shall bring his cause first before the patriarch, but first before his own bishop, then before the metropolitan, after that before a provincial synod, and last of all before the patriarch, from whose judgment there lay no appeal.' The same is repeated and confirmed by other laws[71] of that emperor, which need not here be recited.

A fourth privilege, to censure metropoli

15. As patriarchs might receive appeals from metropolitans, so they had power to *inquire into their administration, and correct and censure them*, in case of heresy or misde-

σαν, πάσης συμψήφου τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ὥσπερ διὰ μιᾶς φωνῆς τὸν ἄνδρα τιμησάσης.

[67] Ep. 81. See before, ch. 16. s. 17. p. 189. n. 87. last part.

[68] C. 9. See s. 10. p. 205. n. 54.

[69] C. 17. See ibid. n. 54.

[70] Cod. l. 1. tit. 4. leg. 30. See ch. 16. s. 16. p. 187. n. 82.

[71] Justin. Novel. 123. c. 22. (t. 5. p. 552) Si quis vero sanctissimorum episcoporum ejusdem synodi dubitationem aliquam ad invicem habeat, sive pro ecclesiastico jure, sive pro aliis quibusdam rebus: prius metropolita eorum cum aliis de sua synodo episcopis causam examinet, et judicet: et si non rata habuerit utraque pars quæ judicata sunt, tunc beatissimus patriarcha diœceseos illius inter eos audiat, et illa determinet, quæ ecclesiasticis canonibus et legibus consonant; nulla parte ejus sententiæ contradicere valente.

meanour, or any mal-administration which made them liable by the canons to ecclesiastical censure. Justinian made an express law to this purpose[72], 'that if any clergyman was accused in point of faith or morals, or transgression of the sacred canons, if he was a bishop he should be examined before his metropolitan, but if he was a metropolitan, then before the archbishop,' that is the patriarch to whom he was subject. By virtue of this power Chrysostom deposed Gerontius[73], metropolitan of Nicomedia; and Atticus decided a controversy between Theodosius and Agapetus[74], who contended about the throne of Synada, the metropolis of Phrygia Pacatiana: and it were easy to add many other instances of the like nature out of the ancient Councils, which concurred with the patriarchs in the exercise of this power. Nor did this power extend only over metropolitans, but over their suffragan bishops also. For though every provincial bishop was to be tried by his own metropolitan and a provincial synod: yet, in case they were negligent and remiss in executing the canons against delinquents, the patriarch had power to take the matter into his own cognizance, and censure any bishop within the limits of his jurisdiction. Thus Sozomen[75] observes of Chrysostom, 'that in one visitation at Ephesus he deposed thirteen bishops of Asia, Lycia, and Phrygia for simony and such other corrupt practices.' This was done in a synod of seventy bishops, held at Ephesus, anno 401, as Valesius[76] and

[72] Novel. 137. c. 5. (t. 5. p. 610.) . . . . . Quoties quidem [leg. quidam] sacerdotum accusabuntur vel de fide, aut turpi vita, aut ob aliquid aliud contra sacros canones admissum: si quidem episcopus est is qui accusatus est, ejus metropolitanus examinet ea quæ dicta sunt. Si vero metropolitanus sit, ejus beatissimus archiepiscopus sub quo degit, &c.

[73] Vid. Sozom. l. 8. c. 6. (v. 2. p. 333. 28.) . . . . Γερόντιον ἐξεωσατο τῆς Νικομηδέων ἐκκλησιας.

[74] Vid. Socrat. l. 7. c. 3. (ibid. p. 349. 32.) Ἀττικὸς . . . . τὸν Θεοδόσιον λόγῳ παρεμυθήσατο, πείσας ἀνεξικάκως τὸν ἡσύχιον βίον ἀσπάζεσθαι, προκρίνειν τε τὰ κοινὰ τῶν ἰδίων διδάξας· γραφεῖ τε τῷ Ἀγαπητῷ, ἔχεσθαι τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς, μηδὲν ἐκ τῆς Θεοδοσίου λύπης ἀπαρὸν ἐφορώμενον.

[75] L. 8. c. 6. (ibid. p. 333. 17.) Ὁ δὲ Ἰωάννης πυθόμενος ὑπὸ ἀναξίων τὰς ἐν Ἀσίᾳ καὶ πέρᾳ ἐκκλησίας ἐπιτροπεύεσθαι, καὶ τοὺς μὲν λήμμασι καὶ δωροδοκίαις, τοὺς δὲ χάριτι ἐπαγομένους τὰς ἱερωσύνας ἀπεμπωλεῖν, ἧκεν εἰς Ἔφεσον· καθελὼν τε δέκα καὶ τρεῖς ἐπισκόπους, τοὺς μὲν ἐν Λυκίᾳ καὶ Φρυγίᾳ, τοὺς δὲ ἐν αὐτῇ Ἀσίᾳ, ἑτέρους ἀντ' αὐτῶν κατέστησε.

[76] Not. in loc. (ibid. p. 334. n. 2.) . . . . Chrysostomus . . . . . in Asiam profectus synodum septuaginta episcoporum Ephesi congregavit, in qua depositi sunt sex episcopi, non autem tredecim, ut ait Sozomenus.

Du Pin[77] observe out of Palladius, who mentions the same thing, though he speaks but of six bishops then deposed.

16. The patriarch had power to *delegate, or send a metropolitan into any part of his diocese, as his commissioner,* to hear and determine ecclesiastical causes in his name. At least it was so in the diocese of Egypt, where Synesius was bishop. For in one of his Epistles[78], writing to Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria, he tells him what a difficult task he had put him upon, when he sent him through an enemy's country, to Hydrax and Palæbisca, two villages in the confines of Libya, to determine a dispute that was risen there, about erecting those places into bishops' sees; 'but,' says he, 'there lies a necessity upon me, *νόμον ἡγεῖσθαι, to take every thing for a law* that is enjoined me by the throne of Alexandria.'

A fifth privilege. Patriarchs might make metropolitans their commissioners, &c.

17. And as the metropolitans did every thing that was canonically enjoined them by the patriarch, so *they did nothing of any great moment without him;* paying the same deference to him, that the canons obliged their suffragans to pay to them. This at least was the custom of Egypt, as appears from a noted passage related in the acts of the council of Chalcedon[79], where we find, that when Pope Leo's Epistle against Eutyches was subscribed by all the bishops in council, the Egyptian bishops then present refused to do it, because they had then no patriarch, and it was not lawful for them to do it without the consent of a patriarch by the rule of the Council of Nice; which orders all the bishops of the Egyptian diocese to follow the archbishop of Alexandria, and do nothing without him. This they pleaded in council, and their plea

A sixth privilege. The patriarch to be consulted by his metropolitans in matters of any great moment.

[77] Biblioth. Vit. Chrysost. (t. 3. p. 9.) Dans cette conjoncture le clergé d'Ephèse et les évêques de cette province s'addressèrent à saint Chrysostome ... Il y vint ... y assembla un synode de soixante et dix évêques, dans lequel il déposa six évêques convaincus d'avoir donné de l'argent à Antonin pour être ordonnez, &c.

[78] Ep. 67. (p. 208 a. 4.) Ἐγὼ καὶ βούλομαι, καὶ ἀνάγκη μοι θεία, νόμον ἡγεῖσθαι πᾶν ὅ, τι ἂν ἐκεῖνος ὁ θρόνος θεσπίσῃ.

[79] Act. 4. (t. 4. p. 512 e.) Ἴσασι πάντες οἱ ἁγιώτατοι ἡμῶν πατέρες, ὅτι ἐν ἅπασιν ἀναμένομεν τὴν γνώμην τοῦ παρ' ἡμῖν ὁσιωτάτου ἀρχιεπισκόπου· καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν τὴν ὑμετέραν φιλανθρωπίαν, ἀναμεῖναι τὴν τοῦ ἡμετέρου προέδρου γνώμην· αὐτῷ γὰρ ἐν ἅπασιν ἀκολουθήσομεν· τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ οἱ ἐπὶ τῆς Νικαέων ἅγιοι πατέρες συναγηγερμένοι ἐκανόνισαν τιή· ὥστε ἀκολουθεῖν πᾶσαν τὴν Αἰγυπτιακὴν διοίκησιν τῷ ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ τῆς μεγαλοπόλεως Ἀλεξανδρείας, καὶ μηδὲν δίχα αὐτοῦ πράττεσθαι παρά τινος τῶν ὑπ' αὐτὸν ἐπισκόπων.

was accepted, and a decree passed in their favour upon it[80]; 'that since this was the custom of the Egyptian diocese, to do nothing of this nature without the consent and authority of their archbishop, they should not be compelled to subscribe till a new archbishop was chosen.'

A seventh privilege. Patriarchs to communicate to the metropolitans such imperial laws as concerned the Church, &c.

18. It was the patriarch's office *to publish both ecclesiastical and civil laws* which concerned the Church, and to take care for the dispersion and publication of them in all churches of their diocese. The method is prescribed by Justinian in the Epilogue to the sixth Novel[81]: 'The patriarchs of every diocese shall publish these our laws in their respective churches, and notify them to the metropolitans under them. The metropolitans likewise shall publish them in their metropolitical churches, and make them known to the bishops under them; that so they may publish them in their respective churches, and no one be left ignorant in our whole empire of what we have enacted for the glory of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.' See also the 42nd Novel[82], directed to Menas, patriarch of Constantinople, concluding in the same tenour.

The eighth privilege. Great criminals reserved to the patriarch's absolution.

19. Synesius observes another privilege in the diocese of Alexandria; which was, that in the exercise of discipline upon great criminals and scandalous offenders, a peculiar deference was paid to the patriarch *by reserving their absolution to his wisdom and discretion.* As he gives an instance in one Lamponianus, a presbyter, whom he had excommunicated for abusing Jason his fellow presbyter: 'Though,' says he[83], 'he expressed his repentance with tears, and the people

[80] Ibid. c. 30. ex Act. 4. (p. 711 a.) Ἐπειδὴ οἱ εὐλαβέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι τῆς Αἰγύπτου, οὐχ ὡς μαχόμενοι τῇ καθολικῇ πίστει ὑπογράψαι τῇ ἐπιστολῇ τοῦ ὁσιωτάτου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Λέοντος ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος ἀνεβάλοντο, ἀλλὰ φάσκοντες, ἔθος εἶναι ἐν τῇ Αἰγυπτιακῇ διοικήσει, παρὰ γνώμην καὶ διατύπωσιν τοῦ ἀρχιεπισκόπου μηδὲν τοιοῦτον ποιεῖν, καὶ ἀξιοῦσιν ἐνδοθῆναι αὐτοῖς ἄχρι τῆς χειροτονίας τοῦ ἐσομένου τῆς τῶν Ἀλεξανδρέων μεγαλοπόλεως ἀρχιεπισκόπου, εὔλογον ἡμῖν ἐφάνη καὶ φιλάνθρωπον, ὥστε αὐτοῖς μένουσιν ἐπὶ τοῦ οἰκείου σχήματος, ἐν τῇ βασιλευούσῃ πόλει, ἔνδοσιν παρασχεθῆναι, ἄχρις ἂν χειροτονηθῇ ὁ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων ἀρχιεπίσκοπος.

[81] See before, ch. 2. s. 18. p. 116. n. 88.

[82] See ibid. n. 88. last part.

[83] Ep. 67. (p. 215 a. 5.) Καί τοι καὶ δάκρυον ἐκ μετανοίας ἀφῆκε, καὶ δῆμος ἱκέτης αὐτὸν ἐξῃτήσατο· ἀλλ' ἐγὼ τοῖς δεδογμένοις ἐνεκαρτέρησα, τοῦ δὲ λῦσαι τὴν αὐθεντίαν εἰς τὴν ἱερατικὴν καθέδραν ἀνέπεμψα· τοσοῦτον οὖν ἐμαυτῷ συνεχώρησα, εἰ προσπελάσειε Λαμπωνιανῷ τὸ χρεῶν, καὶ ἡ κυρία παρεῖναι δόξειε, πᾶσιν ἐφῆκα τοῖς τότε παρεσομένοις πρεσβυτέροις κοινωνίας αὐτῷ μεταδοῦναι· μηδεὶς γὰρ ἀποθάνοι δεδεμένος ἐμοί·

interceded for him, yet I refused to absolve him, but remitted him over for that to the sacred see; only assuming this to myself, that if the man should happen to be in manifest danger of death, any presbyter that was present should receive him into communion by my order. For no man shall go excommunicate out of the world by me. But in case he recovered he should still be liable to the former penalty, and expect the ratification of his pardon from your divine and courteous soul.' But whether this respect was paid by all metropolitans to their patriarch in every diocese I have not yet observed.

The priv The patr abso and pen one othe

20. The last privilege of patriarchs was, that they were originally all *co-ordinate and independent of one another.* I speak now of them as they were at their first institution; for after-ages, and councils, and emperors made great alteration in this matter. At first, learned men[84] reckon, there were about thirteen or fourteen patriarchs in the Church, that is one in every capital city of each diocese of the Roman empire: the patriarch of Alexandria, over the Egyptian diocese; the patriarch of Antioch, over the Eastern diocese; the patriarch of Ephesus, over the Asiatic diocese; the patriarch of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, over the Pontic diocese; Thessalonica, in Macedon or Illyricum Orientale; Sirmium, in Illyricum Occidentale; Rome, in the Roman prefecture; Milan, in the Italic diocese; Carthage, in Afric; Lyons, in France; Toledo, in Spain; and York, in the diocese of Britain. The greatest part of these, if not all, were real patriarchs, and independent of one another, till Rome by encroachment, and Constantinople by law, got themselves made superior to some of their neighbours, who became subordinate and subject unto them. The ancient liberties of the Britannic Churches, as also the African and Italic diocese, and their long contests with Rome, before they could be brought to yield obedience to her, are largely set forth by several of our learned writers[85] in particular dis-

ἀναρρωσθεὶς δὲ, πάλιν ἐπὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς ὑπόδικος ἔστω, καὶ παρὰ τῆς θεσπεσίας σου καὶ φιλανθρώπου ψυχῆς περιμενέτω τῆς συγγνώμης τὸ συνθημα.

[84] Brerewood, Patriarchal Government, Quest. 1. (Brief Treatises, p. 103.) But by this that I have already said of the number of the dioceses, you may see that there were eleven primates besides the three patriarchs, &c.

[85] Brerewood, ibid. Quest. 2 & 3. (pp. 105—115.) and Cave, Ancient Church Government, ch. 5.

courses on this subject. I only here note that the Eastern patriarchs, Alexandria, Antioch, Ephesus, Cæsarea, and Constantinople were never subject to Rome, but maintained the ancient liberty which the canons gave them. For though Cæsarea and Ephesus were made subordinate to the patriarch of Constantinople, and any one might appeal from them to him, yet the appeal was to be carried no further, unless it were to a general Council[86]; which shews the independency of the greater patriarchs one of another.

he patriarch of Constantinople gnified ith the le of *œmenical*, d his urch the ad of all urches.

21. The patriarch of Constantinople had also the honourable title of *œcumenical* or *universal patriarch* given him; probably in regard of the great extent of his jurisdiction. Thus Justinian styles Menas, Epiphanius, and Anthemius, archbishops and œcumenical patriarchs, in several of his Rescripts[87]; and Leo gives the same title to Stephen, *archbishop and universal patriarch*, in ten laws[88] one after another. So that it was no such new thing, as Pope Gregory made it, for the patriarch of Constantinople to be styled œcumenical bishop; for that title was given him by law many years before, even from the time of Justinian: and it is a vulgar error in history to date the original of that title from the time of Gregory I, which was in use at least a whole century before. But Justinian, in another Rescript[89], goes a little further, and says expressly, 'that Constantinople was the head of all churches;' which is as much as ever any Council allowed to Rome, that is, a supremacy in its own diocese, and a precedency of honour in regard that it was the capital city of the empire. Equal privileges are granted to Constantinople, upon the same ground, because it was new Rome, and the royal seat, as the Councils of Constantinople[90]

[86] See the authorities cited before, s. 14. p. 209. n. 68, &c.

[87] Novel. 7. (t. 5. p. 61. Collat. 2. tit. 1.) Imper. Cæsar. Fl. Justinianus August. Epiphanio sanctissimo, et beatissimo archiepiscopo felicis hujus civitatis et œcumenico patriarchæ.—Conf. Novel. 16. tit. 3. (p. 125.) et Novel. 42. tit. 21. (p. 252.) .... Mennæ sanctissimo et beatissimo archiepiscopo et universali patriarchæ.

[88] Novel. 11. ad calc. Cod. Justin. (Amstel. 1663. t. 2. append. p. 242. col. dextr.) Ὁ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς Στεφάνῳ τῷ ἁγιωτάτῳ ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως καὶ οἰκουμενικῷ πατριάρχῃ. Vid. ibid. Novell. 3—12.

[89] Cod. l. 1. tit. 2. c. 24. de Ecclesiis (t. 4. p. 65.) Ἡ ἐν Κωνσταντινοπόλει ἐκκλησία πασῶν τῶν ἄλλων ἐστι κεφαλή.

[90] C. Constant. c. 3. (t. 2. p. 947 c.) Τὸν μέν τοι Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐπίσκοπον ἔχειν τὰ πρεσβεῖα τῆς τιμῆς μετὰ τὸν τῆς Ῥώμης ἐπίσκοπον, διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὴν νέαν Ῥώμην.—C. Chalced. c. 28. (t. 4. p.

and Chalcedon, with some others, word it. So that they had privileges of honour and privileges of power; the first of which were peculiar to those sees; the other, in a great measure, common to them and all other patriarchal Churches, except those of Ephesus and Cæsarea, which, as I have often observed, were legally made subordinate to that of Constantinople.

Of subordinate patriarchs. What figure they made in the Church and that they were not mere titular patriarchs.

22. Some here may be desirous to know what authority those patriarchs had in the Church *after their subordination* to the other. There are who tell us that they were sunk down to the condition of metropolitans again by the Council of Chalcedon; but that is a mistake. For,

First. They retained the name of *exarchs of the diocese* still, and so subscribed themselves in all Councils. As, in the sixth general Council, Theodore subscribes himself metropolitan of Ephesus, and exarch of the Asiatic diocese[91]; and Philalethes, metropolitan of Cæsarea, and exarch of the Pontic diocese.

Secondly. They always *sat and voted in general councils* next immediately after the five great patriarchs, Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, who by the canons[92] had precedence of all the rest. Next to these, before all the metropolitans, the bishops of Ephesus and Cæsarea took place, as may be seen in the subscriptions of the fourth and sixth general Councils[93].

770 a.) Καὶ γὰρ τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης, διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην, οἱ πατέρες εἰκότως ἀποδεδώκασι τὰ πρεσβεῖα· καὶ τῷ αὐτῷ σκοπῷ κινούμενοι οἱ ρν' θεοφιλέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι, τὰ ἴσα πρεσβεῖα ἀπένειμαν τῷ τῆς νέας Ῥώμης ἁγιωτάτῳ θρόνῳ, εὐλόγως κρίναντες, τὴν βασιλείᾳ καὶ συγκλήτῳ τιμηθεῖσαν πόλιν, καὶ τῶν ἴσων ἀπολαύουσαν πρεσβείων τῇ πρεσβυτέρᾳ βασιλίδι Ῥώμῃ, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς, ὡς ἐκείνην, μεγαλύνεσθαι πράγμασι, δευτέραν μετ' ἐκείνην ὑπάρχουσαν.—C. Trull. c. 36. (t. 6. p. 1159 b.) Ὁρίζομεν, ὥστε τὸν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως θρόνον τῶν ἴσων ἀπολαύειν πρεσβείων τοῦ τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης θρόνου, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς ὡς ἐκεῖνον μεγαλύνεσθαι πράγμασι, δεύτερον μετ' ἐκεῖνον ὑπάρχοντα.—Justin. Novel. 131. c. 2. (t. 5. p. 583.)... Sancimus ... sanctissimum senioris Romæ papam primum esse omnium sacerdotum, beatissimum autem archiepiscopum Constantinopoleos, Novæ Romæ, secundum habere locum, &c.

[91] C. Gen. 6. Act. 18. (t. 6. p. 1058 e.) Θεόδωρος, ἐλέῳ Θεοῦ ἐπίσκοπος τῆς Ἐφεσίων μητροπόλεως τῆς Ἀσιανῶν ἐπαρχίας, τῷδε τῷ προσφωνητικῷ ὁμοίως ὑπέγραψα.

[92] C. Trull. ibid. ut supr. (n. 90.) cum verb. sequent.—Μεθ' ὃν ὁ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων μεγαλοπόλεως ἀριθμείσθω θρόνος· εἶτα ὁ τῆς Ἀντιοχέων· καὶ μετὰ τοῦτον ὁ τῆς Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν πόλεως.—Conf. Justin. Novel. 131. c. 2. Vid. ibid. ut supr. (n. 90.)

[93] C. Chalced. Act. 1. (t. 4. p. 318 d.)—Ibid. Act. 3. (p. 449 b.)—C. Gen. 6. Act. 18. (t. 6. p. 1058 a. b. seqq.)

Thirdly. They had power to *receive appeals from metropolitans*, which is evident from the same canons of Chalcedon[94], which give the patriarch of Constantinople power to take appeals from them. So that they were not mere titular patriarchs, as some [were] in after-ages, but had the power as well as the name; the right of ordaining metropolitans and receiving ultimate appeals only excepted. But how long they or any others retained their power, is not my business here any further to inquire.

CHAP. XVIII.

Of the αὐτοκέφαλοι.

1. Among other titles, which were anciently given to some certain bishops, we frequently meet with the name *αὐτοκέφαλοι, absolute and independent bishops;* which was not the name of any one sort of bishops, but given to several upon different reasons. For, first, before the setting up of patriarchs, all metropolitans were *αὐτοκέφαλοι*, ordering the affairs of their own province with their provincial bishops, and being accountable to no superior but a synod; and that in case of heresy, or some great crime committed against religion and the rules of the Church.

2. And even after the advancement of patriarchs, several metropolitans continued thus independent, receiving their ordination from their own provincial synod, and not from any patriarch; terminating all controversies in their own synods, from which there was no appeal to any superior, except a general Council. Balsamon[95] reckons among this sort of *αὐτοκέφαλοι* the metropolitans of Bulgaria, Cyprus, and Iberia: and his observation is certainly true of the two last, who were only metropolitans, yet independent of any patriarchal or superior power. For, though the bishop of Antioch laid claim to the ordination of the Cyprian bishops in the Council of Ephesus, yet the Council upon hearing the case determined against him, making a decree[96], 'that, whereas it never had

[94] Ce. 9 et 17. See ch. 17. s. 10. p. 205. n. 54.

[95] In C. Constant. 1. c. 2. (p. 305 d.) Εἰ δὲ καὶ ἑτέρας ἐκκλησίας αὐτοκεφάλους εὑρίσκεις, ὡς τὴν Βουλγαρίας, τὴν Κύπρου, τὴν Ἰβηρίας, μὴ θαυμάσῃς.

[96] Act. 7. Decret. de Episc. Cypr. See ch. 17. s. 9. p. 204. n. 49.

been the custom for the bishop of Antioch to ordain bishops in Cyprus, the Cyprian bishops should retain their rights inviolable, and, according to canon and ancient custom, ordain bishops among themselves.' And this was again repeated and confirmed by the Council of Trullo[97], even after the Cypriots were driven into another country by the incursions of the barbarians.

Others[98] observe the same privilege in the Iberian Churches, now commonly called Georgians; that they never were subject either to the patriarch of Constantinople, or any other; but all their bishops, being eighteen in number, profess absolute obedience to their own metropolitan, without any other higher dependence or relation.

And this was the case of the Armenian Churches in the time of Photius, as appears from an ancient Greek *Notitia Episcopatuum*, cited by Peter de Marca[99], which says it was an *αὐτοκέφαλος*, and not subject to the throne of Constantinople, but honoured with independency in respect to St. Gregory of Armenia, their first apostle.

And this was also the ancient liberty of the Britannic Church before the coming of Austin the monk, when the seven British bishops, which were all that were then remaining, paid obedience to the archbishop of Caer-Leon, and acknowledged no superior in spirituals above him. As Dinothus, the learned

[97] C. 39. (t. 6. p. 1159 e.) Τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ καὶ συλλειτουργοῦ ἡμῶν Ἰωάννου, τοῦ τῆς Κυπρίων νήσου προέδρου, ἅμα τῷ οἰκείῳ λαῷ ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλησπόντιον ἐπαρχίαν, διά τε τὰς βαρβαρικὰς ἐφόδους, διά τε τὸ τῆς ἐθνικῆς ἐλευθερωθῆναι δουλείας, καὶ καθαρῶς τοῖς σκήπτροις τοῦ Χριστιανικωτάτου κράτους ὑποταγῆναι, τῆς εἰρημένης μεταστάντος νήσου προνοίᾳ τοῦ φιλανθρώπου Θεοῦ, καὶ μόχθῳ τοῦ φιλοχρίστου καὶ εὐσεβοῦς ἡμῶν βασιλέως, συνορῶμεν, ὥστε ἀκαινοτόμητα φυλαχθῆναι τὰ παρὰ τῶν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τὸ πρότερον συνελθόντων θεοφόρων πατέρων τῷ θρόνῳ τοῦ προγεγραμμένου ἀνδρὸς παρασχεθέντα προνόμια κ. τ. λ.

[98] Brerewood, Enquir. ch. 17. (p. 164.)... In no sort subject (neither ever were) to the patriarch of Constantinople; but all their bishops (being 18) profess absolute obedience to their own metropolitan, without any other higher dependance or relation. —Chytræus, de Stat. Eccles. (p. 21.) Ex quibus [Ecclesiæ Christianæ in Asia reliquæ] Syri, et Georgiani, veterem Iberiam et Albaniam incolentes; quos ad Boream Caucasus, ad occasum Colchi (Mengrellios hodie nominant, Trapezuntinis finibus propinquos,) ab ortu, mare Caspium; a meridie, Armenii ambiunt: in octodecim episcopatus, qui uni catholico seu patriarchæ parent, distributi, Græcorum doctrinam et cæremonias in universum sequuntur.

[99] De Primat. n. 27. p. 122. (ad calc. Oper. p. 27.) Χρὴ εἰδέναι, ὅτι αὐτὴ αὐτοκέφαλός ἐστι, μὴ τελοῦσα ὑπὸ ἀποστολικὸν θρόνον, ἀλλὰ τιμηθεῖσα διὰ τὸν ἅγιον Γρηγόριον, Ἀρμενοίας, ἔχουσα πόλεις καὶ κάστρα σ'.

abbot of Bangor, told Austin[1], in the name of all the Britannic Churches, 'that they owed no other obedience to the Pope of Rome than they did to every godly Christian, to love every one in his degree in perfect charity: other obedience than this they knew none due to him whom *he* named pope, &c. But they were under the government of the bishop of Caer-Leon upon Uske, who was their overseer under God.'

A third sort of αὐτοκέφαλοι, such bishops as were subject to no metropolitan, but only to the patriarch of the diocese.

3. Besides all these there was yet a third sort of αὐτοκέφαλοι, which were such bishops as were *subject to no metropolitan*, but immediately under the patriarch of the diocese, who was to them instead of a metropolitan. Thus for instance in the patriarchate or large diocese of Constantinople, the ancient Notitia, published by Leunclavius[2], reckons thirty-nine such bishops throughout the several provinces; that published by Dr. Beveridge[3] counts them forty-one; and the Notitia, in Carolus à Sancto Paulo[4], augments the number to forty-six. The bishop of Jerusalem is said to have had twenty-five such bishoprics in his patriarchate, and the bishop of Antioch sixteen; as Nilus Doxopatrius[5], a writer of the eleventh century, in his book of the patriarchal sees, informs us. But what time this sort of independent bishoprics were first set up in the Church is not certain: for the earliest account we have of them is in the Notitia of the emperor Leo Sapiens, written in the ninth century, where they are called *archbishoprics*, as in some other Notitiæ they are called *metropolitical sees;* though both these names were but titular, for they had no suffragan bishops under them.

[1] Spelman, CC. Britan. an. 601. (t. 1. p. 108.) Responsio Abbatis Bangor, &c.

[2] Jus Gr. Rom. l. 2. (t. 1. p. 89.) 1. Bizya. 2. Leontopolis. 3. Maronea. 4. Germia. 5. Arcadiopolis. 6. Parium. 7. Miletus. 8. Præconesus. 9. Selybria. 10. Chios or Cius. 11. Apros. 12. Cypsella. 13. Nice. 14. Neapolis. 15. Selga. 16. Cherson. 17. Messana. 18. Garella. 19. Bryses. 20. Dercos. 21. Carabizza. 22. Lemnos or Lemnus. 23. Leucas. 24. Misthea. 25. Cudræ. 26. Soteropolis. 27. Pedachthoa. 28. Germa. 29. Bosporus. 30. Cotradis. 31. Eroina. 32. Carpathus. 33. Mesembria. 34. Gotthia. 35. Sugdaia. 36. Phullæ. 37. Ægina. 38. Pharsala. 39. Matracha.

[3] Pandect. Not. in c. 26. C. Trull. (t. 2. append. p. 136.) Hactenus metropolitæ. Hic porro incipiunt autocephali. Provinciæ Mysiæ, A. Odyssi, &c.

[4] Append. ad Geogr. Sacr. (pp. 9, 10.) Autocephalorum archiepiscoporum Notitia. q. v.

[5] Ap. le Moyne, Varia Sacra, t. 1. (p. 232.) Ἔχει δὲ καὶ αὐτοκεφάλους ἐπισκοπὰς εἴκοσι πέντε, μὴ ἐχούσας ὑφ' ἑαυτὰς ἐπίσκοπον, ὑπόκεινται δὲ τῷ θρόνῳ Ἱεροσολύμων α'. τὴν Διοσπόλεως ἤτοι Γεωργίου πόλεως, κ. τ. λ.

4. Valesius mentions another sort of αὐτοκέφαλοι, which were such bishops as were wholly independent of all others. As they had no suffragans under them, so neither did they acknowledge any superior above them, whether metropolitan, or patriarch, or any other whatsoever. Of this sort he reckons[6] the bishops of Jerusalem, before they were advanced to patriarchal dignity. But in this instance he plainly mistakes, and contradicts St. Jerom, who says expressly, 'that the bishop of Jerusalem was subject to the bishop of Cæsarea, as the metropolitan of all Palestine, and to the bishop of Antioch, as metropolitan of the whole East,' as has been noted in the last chapter[7]. If there were any such bishops as he speaks of, they must be such as the bishop of Tomis in Scythia, who, as Sozomen[8] notes, was the only bishop of all the cities of that province; so that he could neither have any suffragans under him, nor metropolitan above him. But such instances are very rare, and we scarce meet with such another example in all the history of the Church.

A fourth sort of αὐτοκέφαλοι.

I have now completed the account of primitive bishops, and shewed the distinctions which were among them in the external polity of the Church. I proceed in the next place therefore to consider the second order of the clergy, which is that of presbyters.

CHAP. XIX.

Of presbyters.

1. The name πρεσβύτεροι, *presbyters* or *elders*, is a word borrowed from the Greek translation of the Old Testament, where it commonly signifies *rulers* and *governors*, being, as St. Jerom[9] notes, a name of office and dignity, and not a mere indication of men's age; for *elders* were chosen, not by their age, but by their merits and wisdom. So that as a senator

The meaning of the name *presbyter*.

[6] Not. in Euseb. l. 5. c. 23. (v. 1. p. 242. n. 6.).... Hierosolymorum episcopis honor semper est habitus, utpote apostolicæ ecclesiæ, quæ prima episcopum habuisset. Itaque quodam honoris privilegio fruebantur ejus sedis episcopi; nec Cæsariensi episcopo subjacebant, sed erant αὐτοκέφαλοι.

[7] See s. 7. p. 201. n. 38.

[8] L. 6. c. 21. (v. 2. p. 244. 11.) Μητροπόλις δέ ἐστι Τόμις ..... εἰσέτι δὲ καὶ νῦν ἔθος παλαιὸν ἐνθάδε κρατεῖ, τοῦ παντὸς ἔθνους ἕνα τὰς ἐκκλησίας ἐπισκοπεῖν. — Conf. l. 7. c. 19. (ibid. p. 307. 5.) Ἀμέλει Σκύθαι πολλαὶ πόλεις ὄντες, ἕνα πάντες ἐπίσκοπον ἔχουσι.

[9] In Esai. 3. t. 5. p. 16. (t. 4. p. 48 d.).... In Scripturis Sanctis presbyteros merito et sapientia eligi, non ætate.

among the Romans, and an alderman in our own language, signifies a person of such an order and station, without any regard to his age; in like manner a presbyter or elder in the Christian Church is one, who is ordained to a certain office, and authorized by his quality, not by his age, to discharge the several duties of that office and station wherein he is placed.

tles bishops times l *pres-* s.

2. And in this large extensive sense, it is readily granted by all, that bishops are sometimes called *presbyters* in the New Testament; for the Apostles themselves do not refuse the title. On the other hand, it is the opinion of many learned men, both ancient[10] and modern[11], that presbyters were sometimes called *bishops*, whilst the bishops that were properly such were distinguished by other titles, as that of *chief priests* and *apostles*, &c. of which I have given a particular account in one of the preceding chapters[12], and there evinced that they, who maintained this identity of names, did not thence infer an

[10] Chrysost. Hom. 1. in Phil. 1. (t. 11. p. 195 b.).... Καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τὸ παλαιὸν ἐκαλοῦντο ἐπίσκοποι καὶ διάκονοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ οἱ ἐπίσκοποι, πρεσβύτεροι.—Hom. 11. in 1 Tim. 3. 8. See ch. 3. s. 5. p. 77. n. 4.—Theodor. in Phil. 1. 1. (t. 3. part. 1. p. 445.) Ἐπισκόπους δὲ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους καλεῖ· ἀμφότερα γὰρ εἶχον κατ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν καιρὸν τὰ ὀνόματα.—In Phil. 2. 25. (ibid. p. 459.) Πολλὰ καὶ τούτου κατορθώματα διεξῆλθεν, οὐκ ἀδελφὸν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ συνεργὸν καὶ συστρατιώτην ἀποκαλέσας. Ἀπόστολον δὲ αὐτὸν κέκληκεν αὐτῶν, ὡς τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν αὐτῶν ἐμπεπιστευμένον· ὡς εἶναι δῆλον, ὅτι ὑπὸ τούτου ἐτέλουν οἱ ἐν τῷ προοιμίῳ κληθέντες ἐπίσκοποι, τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου δηλονότι τὴν ταξιν πληροῦντες.—In 1 Tim. 3. 1. (ibid. p. 652.) Ἐπίσκοπον δὲ ἐνταῦθα τὸν πρεσβύτερον λέγει.—Pseud-Ambros. in Eph. 4. 11. (t. 2. append. p. 241 f.) Nam et Timotheum presbyterum a se creatum episcopum vocat, quia primum presbyteri episcopi appellabantur.—Hieron. in Tit. 1. (t. 7. p. 695 e.) Hæc propterea, ut ostenderemus apud veteres eosdem fuisse presbyteros quos et episcopos.—Ep. 83. [al. 69.] ad Ocean. t. 1. p. 413 a.) .... Apud veteres iidem episcopi et presbyteri.—Ep. 85. [al. 146.] ad Evagr. [Evang.] (ibid. p. 1075 a.) Nam quum Apostolus perspicue doceat, eosdem presbyteros quos episcopos, &c.

[11] Usher, Dissert. in Ignat. c. 49. (Cotel. v. 2. p. 232.) In Ephesina speciatim ecclesia, ipsis Apostolis adhuc superstitibus, et plures fuisse presbyteros, et præsedisse eis unum, quem ecclesiæ illius *angelum* Servator, *episcopum* primitivæ ecclesiæ Patres, in quibus primas tenet Ignatius, appellarunt, jamdudum a Jo. Rainoldo nostro est observatum.—Orig. of Bishops and Metropolitans, p. 55. (Works, pp. 75, seqq.) The judgment of Doctor Rainoldes, &c.—Cotel. Not. in Ignat. Ep. ad Magnes. n. 1. (v. 2. p. 17. n. 3.) Ex eo, quod primis ecclesiæ temporibus, nomina *episcopus* et *presbyter* communia erant primo et secundo ordini sacerdotum, in Epistolis autem Ignatianis semper episcopi appellantur, qui sunt sacerdotes summi, presbyteri vero, qui sunt minores sacerdotes; argumentum palmarium contra earum Epistolarum veritatem et antiquitatem, ducere se putant, &c.

[12] See ch. 2. p. 60, seqq.

identity of offices, but always esteemed bishops and presbyters to be distinct orders.

The original of presbyters properly so called.

3. Here then, taking presbyters in the strictest sense for those only of the second order, we must first inquire into their *original.* The learned Dr. Hammond[13] advanced an opinion about this matter, which is something singular. He asserts, that in Scripture-times, the name of *presbyters* belonged principally, if not alone, to bishops; and that there is no evidence that any of this second order were then instituted, though soon after, he thinks, before the writing of Ignatius's Epistles, there were such instituted in all Churches. The authorities he builds upon are Clemens Romanus and Epiphanius, who say, that in some Churches at first there were bishops and deacons, without any presbyters. But I conceive it will not hence follow, that it was so in all Churches; nor does Epiphanius maintain that, but the contrary, that as in some Churches there were only bishops and deacons, so in others there were only presbyters and deacons: and that in large and populous Churches the Apostles settled both bishops, presbyters, and deacons; as at Ephesus, where Timothy was bishop, and had presbyters subject to him, which Epiphanius proves from Scripture. 'That a bishop and presbyter,' says he[14], 'are not the same, the Apostle informs us, when writing to Timothy, who was a bishop, he bids him not rebuke an elder, but intreat him as a father. How comes the bishop to be concerned not to rebuke an elder, if he had no power over an elder? In like manner the Apostle says, "Against an elder receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses;" but he never said to any presbyter, Receive not an accusation against a bishop; nor did he ever write to any presbyter not to rebuke

[13] Annot. on Act. 11, 30. (v. 3. p. 380.) By all which it appears how fitly this word *πρεσβύτεροι, elders,* being made use of by the Apostles and writers of the New Testament, is affixed to the governors of the Christian Church, the several bishops of several cities, &c.

[14] Hær. 75. Aër. n. 5. (p. 909 d.) *Καὶ ὅτι μὲν οὐ δύναται ταυτὸν εἶναι, διδάσκει ὁ θεῖος λόγος τοῦ ἁγίου Ἀποστόλου, τίς μέν ἐστιν ἐπίσκοπος, τίς δέ ἐστι πρεσβύτερος, ὡς λέγει Τιμοθέῳ, ἐπισκόπῳ ὄντι, Πρεσβύτερον μὴ ἐπιπλήξῃς, ἀλλὰ παρακάλει ὡς πατέρα· τί εἶχε πρᾶγμα, ἐπίσκοπον πρεσβυτέρῳ μὴ ἐπιπλήττειν, εἰ μὴ ἦν ὑπὲρ τὸν πρεσβύτερον ἔχων τὴν ἐξουσίαν; ὡς καὶ πάλιν λέγει, Κατὰ πρεσβυτέρου μὴ ταχέως κατηγορίαν δέχου, εἰ μή τι ἐπὶ δύο καὶ τριῶν μαρτύρων· καὶ οὐκ εἶπέ τινι τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, Μὴ δέξῃ κατηγορίαν κατὰ ἐπισκόπου, οὐδὲ ἔγραψε [περὶ] τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τινὶ μὴ ἐπιπλήττειν ἐπισκόπῳ.*

a bishop.' This plainly implies, that in all such large and populous Churches as that of Ephesus, according to Epiphanius, all the three orders of bishops, presbyters, and deacons were settled by the Apostles, though the smaller Churches were differently supplied at first; some only with presbyters and deacons before bishops were constituted in them, and others only with bishops and deacons without any presbyters. For all Churches had not immediately all the same church-officers upon their first foundation, but time was required to complete their constitution, as bishop Pearson[15] has observed on this very passage of Epiphanius.

4. Admitting then that presbyters, as well as bishops, were originally settled in the Church by the Apostles, we are next to inquire into *the power and privileges* that were proper to their order. And here I shall have occasion to say the less, having already shewed[16] what offices they might perform by virtue of their ordinary power, only acting in dependence on and subordination to their bishop, as the supreme minister of the Church. They might baptize, preach, consecrate, and administer the eucharist, &c. in the bishop's absence, or in his presence, if he authorized and deputed them, as has been noted before. They might also reconcile penitents, and grant them absolution in the bishop's absence: and some think they had power likewise to confirm in cases of necessity, by special license and delegation. But these two things will be considered and discussed more particularly hereafter, when we come to treat of discipline and confirmation. What is further to be noted in this place, is the honour and respect that was paid to them, acting in conjunction with their bishop, who scarce did any thing in the administration and government of the Church without the advice, consent, and amicable concurrence of his presbyters.

5. Hence it was that presbyters were allowed to *sit together with the bishop in the church*, (which privilege was never allowed to deacons:) and their seats were dignified with the name of thrones, as the bishop's was; only with this difference, that his was the high throne, and theirs the second thrones.

[15] Vindic. Ignat. part. 2. c. 13. (Cotel. v. 2. p. 412.).... In aliquibus ecclesiis ab origine fuisse presbyteros, nondum constitutis episcopis; in aliquibus episcopos, nondum additis [al. constitutis] presbyteris.

[16] Ch. 3. ss. 2, 3, 4. pp. 73, seqq.

In allusion to this, Gregory Nazianzen[17], speaking of his own ordination to the degree of presbyter, says, 'his father, who ordained him, brought him by violence to the second thrones.' And in his Vision concerning the church of Anastasia[18], he thus represents the several orders of the Church: 'Methought I saw myself (the bishop) sitting on the high throne, and the presbyters, that is, the guides of the Christian flock, sitting on both sides by me on lower thrones, and the deacons standing by them.' By this we may understand what Constantine meant in his Letter to Chrestus, bishop of Syracuse[19], when, giving him a summons to the Council of Arles, he bids him also bring with him 'two of the second throne,' that is, two presbyters: and what Eusebius means by those words in his Panegyric upon the temple of Paulinus, where he says[20] 'he beautified and adorned the structure with thrones set up on high for the honour of the presidents or rulers;' by which it is plain he means the thrones of the presbyters as well as the bishop; for they were both exalted above the seats of the common people. Nay, both the name and thing was then so usual, that Aerius[21] drew it into an argument to prove the identity and parity of bishops and presbyters. 'A bishop sits upon a throne, and so does a presbyter likewise;' which, though it be but a very lame and foolish argument to prove what he intended, yet it is a plain intimation of what has here been noted to have been the then known custom and practice of the Church. And little regard is to be had to those modern authors, who pretend to say that presbyters had not power to sit in the presence of their bishops;

[17] De Vita sua, (t. 2. p. 6 b.) Κάμπτει βιαίως εἰς θρόνους τοὺς δευτέρους.

[18] Somn. de Templo Anastasiæ, (ibid. p. 78 b.)

Ἔζεσθαι δοκέεσκον ὑπέρθρονος, οὐχ ὑπέρφρυς,
Οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδὲ ὄναρ τῖον ἀγηνορίην.
Οἱ δέ μοι ἀμφοτέρωθεν ὑφεδριόωντο γεραιοὶ,
Ποίμνης ἡγεμόνες, ἔκκριτος ἡλικίη.
Οἱ δ' ἄρ' ὑποδρηστῆρες ἐν εἵμασι παμφανόωσιν
Ἕστασαν, ἀγγελικῆς εἰκόνες ἀγλαΐης.

It. Orat. 20. de Laud. Basil. (t. 1. p. 340 a.) Ἐντεῦθεν αὐτῷ περιῆν καὶ τὸ κράτος τῆς ἐκκλησίας, εἰ καὶ τῆς καθέδρας εἶχε τὰ δεύτερα.

[19] Ap. Euseb. l. 10. c. 5. (v. 1. p. 485. 42.)...Συζεύξας σεαυτῷ καὶ δύο γέ τινας τῶν ἐκ τοῦ δευτέρου θρόνου, οὓς ἂν σὺ αὐτὸς ἐπιλέξασθαι κρίνῃς, κ. τ. λ.

[20] Ibid. c. 4. (p. 474. 11.) Ἀλλὰ γὰρ ὧδε καὶ τὸν νεὼν ἐπιτελέσας, θρόνοις τε τοῖς ἀνωτάτω εἰς τὴν τῶν προέδρων τιμὴν, καὶ προσέτι βάθροις ἐν τάξει τοῖς καθ' ὅλου κατὰ τὸ πρέπον κοσμήσας, κ. τ. λ.

[21] Vid. Epiphan. Hær. 75. Aër. n. 3. (t. 1. pp. 906 d. 907 a.) Καθέζεται ὁ ἐπίσκοπος ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου, καθέζεται καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος.

which is [illegible] of the [illegible] of every [illegible], and the [illegible] of every [illegible] author, in which [illegible] presbyterorum and sedere in presbyterio. Concerning the custom and privilege whereof we are now speaking.

The form of their sitting in a semicircle; whence they were called corona presbyterii.

6. There is one thing further to be noted concerning the manner of their sitting, which was on each hand of the bishop, *in the form or figure of a semicircle*; which is described by the author of the Constitutions[22], under the name of Clemens Romanus, and Gregory Nazianzen, and others. Whence, as the bishop's throne is called the middle throne, or the middle seat, by Theodoret[23] and the Constitutions; so, for the same reason, Ignatius[24] and the Constitutions[25] term the presbyters 'the spiritual crown or circle of the presbytery, and the crown of the Church;' unless we will take this for a metaphorical expression to denote only that presbyters, united with their bishop, were the glory of the Church.

Presbyters the ecclesiastical senate, or council of the church, whom the bishop consulted and

7. This honour was done them in regard to their authority in the Church, wherein they were considered as a sort of ecclesiastical senate, or council to the bishop, who scarce did any thing of great weight and moment without asking their advice, and taking their consent, to give the greater force and authority to all public acts done in the name of the Church. Upon

[22] Vid. Euseb. l. 5. c. 20. (v. 1. p. 239. 8.) . . . Καὶ δύναμαι διαμαρτύρασθαι ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅτι εἴ τι τοιοῦτον ἀκηκόει ἐκεῖνος ὁ μακάριος καὶ ἀποστολικὸς πρεσβύτερος, ἀναβοᾷν ἂν καὶ ἐμφράξας τὰ ὦτα αὐτοῦ, καὶ κατὰ τὸ σύνηθες εἰπών, Ὦ καλὲ Θεέ, εἰς οἵους με καιροὺς τετήρηκας, ἵνα τοιαῦτα ἀκούσωμαι, πεφεύγει δὲ καὶ τὸν τόπον, ἐν ᾧ καθεζόμενος ἢ ἑστὼς τῶν τοιούτων ἀκηκόει λόγων.—Orig. Hom. 2. [al. l. 2.] in Cant. (t. 3. p. 48 f.) Videt et sedem puerorum ejus, ecclesiasticum puto ordinem dicit, qui in episcopatus vel presbyteri sedibus habetur.—C. Carth. 4. c. 34. (t. 2. p. 1203 a.) Ut episcopus, quolibet loco sedens, stare presbyterum non patiatur.—Ibid. c. 35. (b.) Ut episcopus in ecclesia, et in consessu presbyterorum, sublimior sedeat.—C. Laod. c. 56. (t. 1. p. 1505 d.) Ὅτι οἱ δεῖ πρεσβύτερον τοῦ τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ ἐπισκόπου εἰσιέναι καὶ καθέζεσθαι ἐν τῷ βήματι, ἀλλὰ μετὰ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου εἰσιέναι.—C. Ancyr. c. 18. (ibid. p. 1464 a.) Ἐὰν μέν τοι βούλοιντο εἰς τὸ πρεσβυτέριον καθέζεσθαι, κ.τ.λ.—Constit. Apost. l. 2. c. 57. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 261.) . . . Κείσθω δὲ μέσος ὁ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου θρόνος· παρ' ἑκάτερα δὲ αὐτοῦ καθεζέσθω τὸ πρεσβυτέριον.

[23] See the last quotation in the foregoing note.

[24] L. 5. c. 3. (v. 3. p. 196. 15.) Εἰ δὲ ὁ μέσος θῶκος τὴν ἔρω γεννᾷ, ἐγὼ καὶ ταύτην ἐξελάσαι πειράσομαι.

[25] Ep. ad Magnes. n. 13. (Cotel. v. 2. p. 21.) . . . Μετὰ τοῦ ἀξιοπρεπεστάτου ἐπισκόπου ὑμῶν, καὶ ἀξιοπλόκου [καὶ] πνευματικοῦ στεφάνου τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου ὑμῶν.

[26] L. 2. c. 28. Cotel. ibid. p. 241.) Ὅτι Ἀπόστολοι καὶ τὸν τόπον φυλάττουσιν, ἐν ᾧ κάθηται τοῦ ἐπισκόπου καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας στέφανος.

which account, St. Chrysostom[27] and Synesius[28] style them 'the court, or sanhedrim of the presbyters;' and Cyprian[29], 'the sacred and venerable bench of the clergy;' St. Jerom[30] and others[31], 'the Church's senate,' and 'the senate of Christ;' Origen[32] and the author of the Constitutions[33], 'the bishop's counsellors,' and 'the council of the Church:' because, though the bishop was prince and head of this ecclesiastical senate, and nothing could regularly be done without him; yet neither did he ordinarily do any public act, relating to the government or discipline of the Church, without their advice and assistance.

advised with u all occ sions.

8. The first ages afford the most pregnant proofs of this divine harmony between the bishop and his presbyters; for any one that ever looked into the writings of Cyprian must acknowledge that at Rome and Carthage, the two great Churches of the West, all things were thus transacted by joint consent: the bishop with his clergy did *communi consilio ponderare*[34], *weigh things by common advice and deliberation.* Whether it was in the ordinations of the clergy, (for Cyprian would not so much as ordain a subdeacon or a reader without their consent,) or whether it was in the exercise of discipline and reconciliation of penitents, Cyprian[35] declares his resolution to do all by common consent. And so Cornelius at the same time acted at Rome; for when Maximus and the rest of the Confessors, who had sided with Novatian, came afterward and

Some dence of Ign and Cy of the er and rogati presby in con tion w the bi

[27] De Sacerdot. l. 3. c. 15. (t. 1. p. 392 e.) Εἰς πολλὰ τότε σχίζονται μέρη· καὶ οὔτε πρὸς ἀλλήλους, οὔτε πρὸς αὐτὸν τὸν λαχόντα τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν, τὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων συνέδριον ὁμογνωμονοῦν ἴδοι τις ἄν.

[28] Ep. 67. ad Theophil. (p. 209 c. 5.) Ἐλέγετο τοίνυν καὶ ἐν συνεδρίῳ παρὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, καὶ δημοσίᾳ, κ. τ. λ.

[29] Ep. 55. [al. 59.] ad Cornel. (p. 268.) .... In Cleri sacrum venerandumque consessum, &c.— C. Carth. 4. c. 35. (t. 2. p. 1203 b.) Episcopus in ecclesia et consessu presbyterorum sublimior sedeat, &c.

[30] In Esai. 3. t. 5. p. 17. (t. 4. p. 51 a.) Et nos habemus in ecclesia senatum nostrum, cœtum presbyterorum.

[31] Pius, Ep. 2. [Labb. Ep. 4.] ad Just. Viennens. (CC. t. 1. p. 577 c.) Salutat te senatus pauper Christi, apud Romam constitutus.

[32] In Matth. Βουλὴ ἐκκλησίας, as cited by Pearson, Vindic. Ignat. part. 1. c. 11. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 321.) who adds, Hi autem βουλευταὶ Christiani sane fuerunt presbyteri.

[33] L. 2. c. 28. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 241.) .... Σύμβουλοι τοῦ ἐπισκόπου .... συνέδριον καὶ βουλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας.

[34] Ep. 33. [al. 38.] ad Cler. (p. 222.) In ordinationibus clericis ... solemus vos ante consulere, et mores ac merita singulorum communi consilio ponderare.

[35] Ep. 6. [al. 14.] ad Cler. (p. 191.) .. Ut ea, quæ circa ecclesiæ gubernaculum utilitas communis exposcit, tractare simul, et plurimorum consilio examinata limare possemus.

made confession of their error, and desired to be admitted again into the communion of the Church, Cornelius[36] would do nothing in it till he had first called a presbytery, and taken both their advice and consent in the affair, that he might proceed according to their unanimous resolution. Cyprian in several other of his Epistles[37] speaks of the same deference paid to his presbytery, and in one place[38] he more particularly tells them, 'that it was a law and a rule that he had laid down to himself, from the first entrance on his bishopric, that he would do nothing without their advice and the consent of the people.' Epiphanius observes the same practice at Ephesus, in the condemnation of Noëtus; for first, he says, 'he was convened before the presbytery[39], and then again, upon a relapse, by them expelled the Church;' which at least must mean, that the bishop and his presbyters joined together in this ecclesiastical censure. In like manner, speaking of the first condemnation of Arius, he says[40], 'Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, called a presbytery against him, before whom, and some bishops then present, he examined him, and expelled him.' Cotelerius, in his Notes upon the Constitutions[41], has published from an ancient manuscript one of the forms of Arius's deposition, which may give some light to this matter: for thereby it appears, that when Alexander sent forth his circular letters to all other bishops against Arius, he first summoned all the presbyters and

[36] Ep. 46. [al. 49.] ad Cypr. p. 92. (p. 235.) Omni actu ad me perlato, placuit contrahi presbyterium...ut, firmato consilio, quid circa personam eorum observari deberet consensu omnium statueretur.

[37] Ep. 24. [al. 29.] ad Cler. (p. 208.) Ne quid conscientiam vestram lateret, &c.—Conf. Ep. 32. ad Cler. (p. 216.) De cæteris vero quæ agenda erunt, sicut et collegis meis plurimis scripsi, plenius consilio communi tractabimus, quando convenire in unum, permittente Domino, cœperimus.

[38] Ep. 6. [al. 14.] (p. 192.) Quando a primordio episcopatus mei statuerim, nihil sine consilio vestro, et sine consensu plebis, mea privata sententia [al. privatim] gerere; sed cum ad vos per Dei gratiam venero .... in commune tractabimus.

[39] Hær. 57. Noëtian. n. 1. (t. 1. p. 480 a.) Ἐπὶ πρεσβυτερίου ἀγόμενος.—Ibid. (b.) Οἱ αὐτοὶ πρεσβύτεροι.... ἐξέωσαν αὐτὸν τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἅμα τοῖς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ δόγμα μεμαθητευμένοις.

[40] Hær. 69. Arian. n. 3. (t. 1. p. 729 d.) Συγκαλεῖται τὸ πρεσβυτέριον ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος καὶ ἄλλους τινὰς ἐπισκόπους παρόντας, καὶ ἀνέτασιν τούτου ποιεῖται καὶ ἀνάκρισιν· ὡς δὲ οὐκ ἐπείσθη τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, ἐξεοῖ αὐτὸν τῆς ἐκκλησίας.

[41] L. 8. c. 28. (v. 1. p. 411.).. Ἵνα καὶ τὰ νῦν γραφόμενα γνῶτε, τήν τε ἐν τούτοις συμφωνίαν ἑαυτῶν ἐπιδείξησθε, καὶ τῇ καθαιρέσει τῶν περὶ Ἄρειον σύμψηφοι γένησθε.

deacons of Alexandria, and region of Mareotes, not only to hear what he had written, but also to testify their consent to it, and declare that they agreed with him in the condemnation of Arius. From whence we learn, that though the deposition was properly the bishop's act, yet, to have it done with the greater solemnity, the consent both of the presbyters and deacons was required to it. And thus it was also in the condemnation of Origen: the Council of Alexandria, which expelled him the city, was composed both of bishops and presbyters, who decreed, 'that he should remove from Alexandria, and neither teach nor inhabit there;' as Pamphilus relates in the second book of his Apology for Origen, some fragments of which are preserved in Photius[42]. The Council of Rome, that was gathered against Novatian[43], consisted of sixty bishops, and many more presbyters and deacons. The first Council of Antioch that was held against Paulus Samosatensis[44] had also presbyters and deacons in it: the name of one of them, Malchion[45], a presbyter of Antioch, is still remaining in the Synodical Epistle among the bishops in the inscription.

From all which it appears, that this was an ancient privilege of presbyters to sit and deliberate with bishops, both in their consistorial and provincial councils. And if we ascend yet higher, we shall find matters always thus transacted in the Church *ab origine;* as appears from Ignatius, whose writings, as a learned man[46] observes, speak as much for the honour of the presbytery as they do for the superiority of episcopacy, no

[42] Biblioth. Cod. 118. (p. 297. 42.) *Σύνοδος ἀθροίζεται ἐπισκόπων καὶ τινῶν πρεσβυτέρων κατ' Ὠριγένους.*

[43] Ap. Euseb. l. 6. c. 43. (v. 1. p. 310. 5.) *Ἐφ' ᾧ συνόδου μεγίστης ἐπὶ Ῥώμης συγκροτηθείσης ἑξήκοντα μὲν τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἐπισκόπων· πλειόνων δὲ ἔτι μᾶλλον πρεσβυτέρων τε καὶ διακόνων, κ. τ. λ.*

[44] Ibid. l. 7. c. 28. (p. 358. 5.) .. *Μυρίους τε ἄλλους οὐκ ἂν ἀπορῆσαί τις, ἅμα πρεσβυτέροις καὶ διακόνοις, τῆς αὐτῆς ἕνεκεν αἰτίας ἐν τῇ προειρημένῃ πόλει τηνικάδε συγκροτηθέντας ἀπαριθμούμενος.*

[45] [Ibid. c. 30. (p. 359. 31.) ..... *Ἕλενος, καὶ Ὑμέναιος, καὶ Θεόφιλος, καὶ Θεότεκνος, καὶ Μάξιμος, Πρόκλος, Νικόμας, καὶ Αἰλιανὸς, καὶ Παῦλος, καὶ Βώλανος, καὶ Πρωτογένης, καὶ Ἱέραξ, καὶ Εὐτύχιος, καὶ Θεόδωρος, καὶ Μαλχίων, καὶ Λούκιος, κ. τ. λ.* *Grischov.*]

[46] Pearson, Vindic. Ignat. part. 2. c. 16. (Cotel. v. 2. p. 428.) Et si quid ego in hac re intelligo, quicunque presbyterali dignitati auctoritatique maxime student, non habent suæ existimationis firmius aut solidius fundamentum, quam Epistolas sancti Ignatii nostri: Neque enim in ullo vere antiquo scriptore extra has Epistolas tot ac tanta presbyteratus præconia invenient, neque illius ordinis honorem sine episcopatus prærogativa ullibi constitutum reperient.

ancient author having given so many great and noble characters of the presbytery as he does. For which reason it concerns those who are most zealous for the honour and authority of presbyters, to look upon Ignatius as one of the best assertors and defenders of their power and reputation: for he always joins the bishops and presbyters together as presiding over the Church, the one in the place of God and Jesus Christ, and the other as the great council of God in the room of the Apostles. Thus in his Epistle to the Ephesians[47] he bids them 'be subject to the bishop and the presbytery;' and in his Epistle to the Magnesians[48], he commends Sotion, the deacon, because 'he was subject to the bishop as the gift of God, and to the presbytery[49] as the law of Christ;' and a little after, in the same Epistle, he speaks of the bishop as 'presiding in the place of God, and the presbyters in the place of the council of Apostles.' So in his Epistle to the Trallians[50] he bids them 'be subject to the presbytery, as to the Apostles of Jesus Christ;' and again[51], 'reverence the presbyters, as the council of God, and the united company of Apostles, without which no Church is called a Church.' Several other passages of the same importance may be seen in his Epistles to Polycarp and the Church of Smyrna[52].

9. And indeed all his Epistles are so full of great eulogiums of the presbytery, as acting in the nature of *an ecclesiastical senate together with the bishop*, that our late learned defender of those Epistles thence concludes,—that the power and privileges of presbyteries was greater in the second century, when

[47] Ep. ad Ephes. n. 2. (Cotel. v. 2. p. 12.) .. Ἵνα ἐπιτασσόμενοι [al. ὑποτασσόμενοι] τῷ ἐπισκοπῷ καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ, κ. τ. λ.

[48] Ep. ad Magnes. n. 2. (ibid. p. 18.) .... Καὶ τοῦ συνδούλου μου διακόνου Σωτίωνος, ὅτι ὑποτάσσεται τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ὡς χάριτι Θεοῦ, καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ ὡς νόμῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

[49] Ibid. n. 6. (p. 18.) ... Προκαθημένου ἐπισκόπου εἰς τόπον Θεοῦ, καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων εἰς τόπον συνεδρίου τῶν Ἀποστόλων, κ. τ. λ.

[50] Ep. ad Trall. n. 2. (ibid. p. 22.) Ἀναγκαῖον οὖν ἐστιν, ὥσπερ ποιεῖτε, ἄνευ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου μηδὲν πράσσειν ὑμᾶς· ἀλλ' ὑποτάσσεσθαι καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ, ὡς τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις Ἰησου Χριστοῦ, κ. τ. λ.

[51] Ibid. n. 3. (ibid. p. 23.).... Ὡς συνέδριον Θεοῦ, καὶ ὡς σύνδεσμον Ἀποστόλων· χωρὶς τούτων ἐκκλησία οὐ καλεῖται.

[52] Ep. ad Polycarp. n. 6. (ibid. p. 42.) Ἀντίψυχον ἐγὼ τῶν ὑποτασσομένων [τῷ] ἐπισκόπῳ, πρεσβυτερίῳ, [al. πρεσβυτέροις,] διακόνοις, κ. τ. λ. —Ep. ad Smyrn. n. 8. (ibid. p. 37.) Πάντες τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ἀκολουθεῖτε, ὡς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τῷ Πατρί· καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ, ὡς τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις, κ. τ. λ.

Ignatius lived, than in the fourth age of the Church; when he thinks the powers and authority of presbyteries was a little sunk and diminished over all the world, and even at Alexandria itself, where it had most of all flourished. And this he makes an argument of the antiquity of those Epistles, that they were the genuine product of Ignatius; because[53] no one of the fourth age would have given such encomiums of the presbytery, or armed them with so great authority and power. I shall not dispute this matter, nor enter upon any nice comparison of the different powers of presbyters in these two ages, but only represent to the reader what privileges still remained to them in the fourth century.

nish the cent

10. And here it cannot be denied, but that in this age, in the ordination of a presbyter, all the presbyters that were present were allowed, nay even required, to join with the bishop *in imposition of hands upon the party to be ordained.* That it was so in the African Churches is beyond all dispute, for in the fourth Council of Carthage there is a canon[54] expressly enjoining it: 'When a presbyter is ordained, while the bishop pronounces the benediction, and lays his hand upon his head, all the presbyters that are present shall lay their hands by the bishop's hand upon his head also.' And this in all likelihood was the universal practice of the Church; for in the Constitutions of the Church of Alexandria[55] there is a rule to the same purpose. In the Latin Church, the decree of the Council of Carthage seems also to have prevailed; because it is inserted into their canon-law by Gratian and other collectors[56], from whence it became the common practice of our own Church,

Yet they adm to jo the in th posi hand the tion pres

[53] Pearson, Vindic. Ignat. part. 2. c. 16. (Cotel. ibid. p. 428.) Nemo enim tam seris ecclesiæ temporibus .. presbyterium tot laudibus cumulasset, tanta auctoritate armasset, cujus potestas ea tempestate, etiam Alexandriæ, ubi maxime floruerat, tantopere imminuta est.

[54] C. 3. (t. 2. p. 1199 e.) Presbyter cum ordinatur, episcopo eum benedicente et manum super caput ejus tenente, etiam omnes presbyteri, qui præsentes sunt, manus suas juxta manum episcopi super caput illius teneant.

[55] Eccles. Alexandr. Constit. c. 6. ap. Bevereg. Not. in Can. Apost. 2. (t. 2. append. p. 13.) Cum vult episcopus ordinare presbyterum, manum suam capiti ejus imponat, simulque omnes presbyteri istud tangant.

[56] Decret. part. 1. dist. 23. c. 8. (t. 1. p. 111. 24.) Presbyter cum ordinatur, episcopo eum benedicente et manum super caput ejus tenente, etiam omnes presbyteri, qui præsentes sunt, manus suas juxta manum episcopi super caput illius teneant.

which is continued to this day. Some ancient Canons[57] indeed say, that one bishop alone shall ordain a presbyter: but that is not said to exclude presbyters from assisting, but only to put a difference between the ordination of a bishop and a presbyter: for the ordination of a bishop could not regularly be performed without the concurrence of three bishops with the metropolitan; but a presbyter might be ordained by a single bishop, without any other assistance save that of his presbyters joining with him. And this plainly appears to have been the practice of the fourth century.

And allowed to sit in consistory with their bishops.

11. It is further evident from the records of the same age, that presbyters had still the privilege of *sitting in consistory with their bishops:* for Pope Siricius, in the latter end of this century, acted as Cornelius had done before him. When he went about to condemn the errors of Jovinian, he first called a presbytery[58], and with their advice censured his doctrines; and then, with the consent of the deacons also and the rest of the clergy, expelled him the Church. And so likewise Synesius, bishop of Ptolemais, proceeded against Andronicus, the impious and blaspheming prefect of Pentapolis: he first laid open his horrible crimes before the consistory of his Church, and then with their consent pronounced the sentence of excommunication against him; which he therefore calls the act of the consistory or sanhedrim of Ptolemais, in the circular letters[59] which he wrote to give notice of his excommunication to other Churches. Baronius, indeed, and the common editors of the Councils, reckon this by mistake among the provincial synods. But it appears evidently from Synesius, that it was only the private consistory of the Church of Ptolemais: for he says expressly[60], 'the Church of Ptolemais gave notice of this

[57] Can. Apost. 2. (Cotel. [c. 1.] v. 1. p. 437.) Πρεσβύτερος ὑπὸ ἑνὸς ἐπισκόπου χειροτονείσθω.—C. Carth. 3. c. 45. (t. 2. p. 1176 b.)... Episcopus unus esse potest, per quem dignatione divina presbyteri multi constitui possunt.

[58] Ep. 2. ad Eccles. Mediolan. (CC. t. 2. p. 1024 a.) Facto .... presbyterio, constitit doctrinæ nostræ, id est, Christianæ legi, esse contraria..... Unde omnium nostrorum, tam presbyterorum et diaconorum, quam totius cleri, unam scitote fuisse sententiam, ut Jovinianus, Auxentius ... in perpetuum damnati, extra ecclesiam remanerent.

[59] Ep. 57. p. 190. (p. 201 a. 12.) Νυνὶ δὲ οἷς τὸ συνέδριον μετῆλθε τὴν Ἀνδρονίκου μανίαν, ἀκούσατε.

[60] Ep. 58. p. 199. (p. 203 a. 2.) ..... Ἡ Πτολεμαΐδος ἐκκλησία, τάδε πρὸς τὰς ἁπανταχοῦ γῆς ἑαυτῆς ἀδελφὰς διατάττεται..... Εἰ δέ τις ὡς μι-

excommunication to all her sister Churches throughout the world, requiring them to hold Andronicus excommunicated, and not to despise her act, as being only a poor church in a small city:' which agrees very well with the state of a private consistory, but is not spoken in the style of a provincial council.

As a prov coun

12. Yet this is not said with any design to deny that presbyters were allowed *to sit in provincial synods;* for there are undeniable evidences of their enjoying this privilege within the compass of the fourth century, and after-ages also. In the Council of Eliberis, which was held in the beginning of the fourth age, there were no less than thirty-six presbyters sitting together with the bishops, as is expressly said in the Acts[61] of the Council. The first Council of Arles, called by Constanstine, had also several presbyters in it, the names of many of which are lost, as are also the names of most of the bishops, who were two hundred; yet the names of fifteen presbyters[62] are still remaining. And it is observable, that in Constantine's *tractoriæ*, or *letters of summons*, the presbyters as well as bishops were called by imperial edict to attend at that Council; if we may judge of all the rest by that one example, which remains upon record in Eusebius: for there, in the letter sent to summon Chrestus, bishop of Syracuse, orders are given him[63] 'to bring along with him two of the second throne;' which phrase, as has been observed before, denotes two presbyters. So that from hence it is clear that presbyters were then privileged to sit in council with their bishops, and that by imperial edict. In Justellus's *Bibliotheca Juris Canonici* there are three or four Roman Councils where the presbyters are particularly mentioned as sitting, and sometimes voting with the bishops. In the Council under Hilarius, anno 491, the presbyters of Rome all sat[64] together with the bishops, and

κροπολῖτιν ἀποσκυβαλίσει τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ δέξεται τοὺς ἀποκηρύκτους αὐτῆς, ὡς οὐκ ἀνάγκῃ τῇ πένητι πείθεσθαι, κ. τ. λ.

[61] Procem. (t. 1. p. 969 e.) Residentibus etiam triginta et sex [Labb. viginti et sex] presbyteris, astantibus diaconibus et omni plebe.

[62] In Catalogo eorum, qui Concilio interfuerunt.—(Ibid. p. 1429 d.) In Edit. Crabb. male vocatur *Secundum.*

[63] L. 10. c. 5. See before, s. 5. p. 223. n. 19.

[64] C. Rom. ap. Justel. Bibl. Jur. Canon. (t. 1. p. 250.) Residentibus etiam universis presbyteris, adstantibus quoque diaconibus, &c.

the deacons stood by them. So again in the Council under Felix, anno 487[65], the names of seventy-six presbyters are mentioned that sat together with the bishops in council, the deacons as before standing by them. And in the Council under Symmachus, anno 499, sixty-seven presbyters and six deacons subscribed in the very same form[66] of words as the bishops did. In another Council, under the same Symmachus, anno 502, thirty-six presbyters[67] are named, who sat therein. And in the Council under Gregory the Second, anno 715, the bishops, presbyters, and deacons, all subscribe in the same[68] form to the decrees then published by them all together.

The like instances may be seen in the first Councils of Toledo[69] and Bracara[70]; where we may also observe the difference made between presbyters and deacons, that the presbyters are always represented as sitting together with their bishops, but the deacons only standing by to attend them. All which notwithstanding, Cellotius the Jesuit and some others of that strain have the confidence to assert, that presbyters were never allowed to sit with bishops in their councils. Bellarmin[71] does not go so far, but only denies them a decisive voice there: in which assertion he is opposed, not only by the generality of Protestant writers[72], but also by Habertus[73], and

[65] Ibid. (p. 255.) Ex presbyteris, Rustico Laurentio, &c.

[66] Ibid. (p. 259.) Subscripserunt presbyteri numero sexaginta-septem. Cælius Laurentius archipresbyter tituli Praxedis hic subscripsi et consensi synodalibus constitutis, atque in hac me profiteor manere sententia, etc.

[67] Ibid. (p. 261.) Residentibus etiam presbyteris, Projectitio, Martino, &c. Adstantibus quoque diaconibus, &c.

[68] Ibid. (p. 274.) Sisinnius humilis presbyter .... huic constituto a nobis promulgato subscripsi. Petrus archidiaconus huic constituto a nobis promulgato subscripsi.

[69] Tolet. 1. (t. 2. p. 1223 b.) Convenientibus episcopis in ecclesia ... considentibus presbyteris, astantibus diaconis, &c.

[70] Brac. 1. [Labb. Brac. 2.] (t. 5. p. 836 c.) Considentibus simul episcopis, præsentibus quoque presbyteris, astantibusque ministris vel universo clero.

[71] De Concil. l. 1. c. 15. (t. 2. p. 30 c.).... Cæteri nunquam sunt admissi, nisi ad consultandum, excepto Concilio Basiliensi, ubi presbyteri admissi sunt ad suffragium decisivum, sed perperam et contra morem omnis antiquitatis.

[72] Morton, Apol. Cathol. part 2. l. 4. c. 8. (pp. 359, seqq.) *Secundum medium spretum atque rejectum, quia liberum atque integrum non est theologis doctissimis in concilio vocem decisivam exercere.*—Whittaker, de Concil. Quæst. 3. (Cantab. 1600. pp. 78, seqq.) *Quinam sint ad Concilium revocandi.*

[73] Not. in Archierat. s. Libr. Pontific. Græc. (p. 175.) At sententiam non ferebant, nec subscribebant, dicet aliquis? Itane vero? Per singula ire nihil necesse est, sed quædam lustranda sunt. In eodem Concilio Chalcedonensi Philippus pres-

other learned defenders[74] of the Gallican liberties in his own communion. So that it is agreed on all hands by unprejudiced writers, and curious searchers of antiquity, that presbyters had liberty to sit and deliberate with bishops in provincial councils.

13. But as to general or universal Councils, there are some Protestant writers who seem to make it a dispute whether presbyters anciently were allowed to sit in them. A learned person[75] of our own Church says, 'it was never before heard of that priests did sit in œcumenical councils,' meaning, before the Council of Lateran, under Callistus the Second, anno 1123, where six hundred abbots were present. But I see no reason why we may not reckon the first Council of Arles a general Council, if a multitude of bishops from all quarters can make it so; for there were two hundred bishops present, and, as I noted before, several presbyters were ordered to come along with them. However, the Council of Constantinople, anno 381, is reckoned by all a general Council, though there were but one hundred and fifty bishops in it; and there we find three presbyters together[76] subscribing among the bishops also. The learned Habertus[77] gives several other instances out of the Council of Chalcedon, the second Council of Nice, the eighth Council called against Photius, and others. From all which, and what has here been alleged, it must be concluded that presbyters had anciently the privilege of sitting and voting also in general Councils.

14. These prerogatives of presbyters being thus allowed in so many cases to act in conjunction with their bishops, advanced their character and reputation very high, and made them of great esteem in the Church; insomuch that many of *the same titles of honour* which were given to bishops, were

byter ecclesiæ Cpolitanæ fert sententiam. In Concilio septimo œcumenico Leo presbyter ita subscribit; *Λέων χάριτι Χριστοῦ πρεσβύτερος τῆς ἁγιωτάτης τοῦ Θεοῦ καθολικῆς μεγάλης ἐκκλησίας.*

[74] Ranchin, (Review of the Council of Trent, b. 1. ch. 8. Oxford, 1638. fol. pp. 36, seqq.) *That all those who ought to have had a decisive or deliberative voice in the Counsell were not called.*

[75] Bp. Burnet, Vindication of the Ordinations, &c. Pref. (p. 22.) Originally abbots were but laymen, but now they must all be priests; yet it was never heard, &c.

[76] Ap. Labb. (t. 2. p. 957 b.) Tyrannus, presbyter Amorii: Auxanon, presbyter Apameæ: Helladius, presbyter Commanensis.

[77] See n. 73, preceding.

rence
ere was
tween
em, as
plied to
ith.

with a little variation given to presbyters also. Hence they are called *πρόεδροι*, by Synesius and Eusebius[78]; *προεστῶτες*, by Nazianzen[79] and Basil; *προστάται*, by Chrysostom[80] and Nazianzen likewise; which names answer to the titles of *prepositi* and *antistites* in Latin, and signify presidents, or rulers and governors of the people. I know indeed some learned persons[81] are of opinion, that the name *antistes* is never given to any presbyter by any ancient writer. But this assertion must be understood with a little qualification, otherwise it will not be exactly true; for Hilarius Sardus[82], speaking of presbyters, against whom a bishop is not to receive an accusation but before two or three witnesses, gives them expressly the title of *antistites Dei*. So does also the author of the Questions upon the Old and New Testament[83] under the name of St. Austin. And though *prepositi*, in Cyprian's Epistles, commonly signifies *bishops*, yet it does not always so: for the presbyters of Rome, writing[84] to the clergy of Carthage, style themselves *prepositi;* and Celerinus[85], in his Epistle to Lucian, gives them the same title. But Sidonius Apollinaris[86]

[78] Ep. 12. (p. 171 d. e.) Ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ πάσης εὐφήμου μνήμης ἄγε τὸν ἱερὸν ἐκεῖνον, καὶ θεοφιλῆ πρεσβύτην τὸν ἀποδεξάντα σε πρόεδρον δήμου. —Conf. Euseb. l. 10. c. 4. See before, s. 5. p. 223. n. 20.

[79] Orat. 1. (t. 1. p. 6 b.) Οὐ γὰρ οὕτως οὔτε δεσποτικοῦ δεσμῆς μεταλαμβάνει χαλεπῶς ἐφάπτεσθαι, οὔτε δυσωδίας ἢ τοῦ ἐναντίου τὸ πλησιάσαι, οὔτε τοιόνδε τις οὕτως εὐκόλως ἀναχείται εἰς τὸν ἀέρα, καὶ διὰ τοῦ ἀέρος ὁμιλεῖ τοῖς ξένοις ἀτμοῖς, ὁ δὲ λοιμὸς ἔστι τε καὶ ὀνομάζεται· ὃν φιλεῖ τάχιστα τῆς τοῦ προεστῶτος κακίας ἀναπιμπλάσθαι τὸ ὑπήκοον, καὶ πολλῷ γε χάλεπον, ἢ τοῦ ἐναντίου, τῆς ἀρετῆς.—Conf. Basil. Regul. Moral. 71. (al. 70.) c. 36. (t. 2. part 1. p. 427 b.) Ὅτι δεῖ τὸν προεστῶτα τοῦ λόγου μετὰ περισκέψεως καὶ δοκιμασίας πολλῆς, κατὰ σκοπὸν τῆς πρὸς Θεὸν εὐαρεστήσεως, ἕκαστον ποιεῖν τε καὶ λέγειν. (Conf. etiam cc. 9, 10, 11, 19, 23. Ep.)

[80] Hom. 11. in 1 Tim. 3. 8. See before, ch. 3. s. 5. p. 77. n. 4.—Greg. Naz. Orat. 1. (t. 1. p. 37 a.) Ψυχῶν προστασίαν δεξάσθαι, ἢ μεσιτείαν Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων (τοῦτο γὰρ ἴσως ὁ ἱερεὺς) οὐκ ἀσφαλὲς εἶναι γινώσκω.

[81] Bevereg. Not. in C. Ancyr. c. 13. (t. 2. append. p. 177.) . . . . Neque enim presbyter unquam antistes dicitur.

[82] Pseud-Ambros. in 1 Tim. 5, 19. (t. 2. append. p. 301 a.) Hujus ordinis sublimis honor est; [hujusmodi enim vicarii sunt Christi.] Idcirco non facile de hac persona accusatio debet admitti. Incredibile enim debet videri, istum qui Dei antistes est criminose versatum.

[83] Quæst. Vet. et Nov. Test. c. 101. (t. 3. append. p. 76 b.) Propter quod antistites Dei sunt, in domo Dei et in honore Christi cum dignitate consistunt.

[84] Ep. 3. [al. 8.] ap. Cypr. (p. 180.) Et cum incumbat nobis, qui videmur præpositi esse, et vice pastoris custodire gregem, &c.

[85] Ep. 21. ap. Cypr. (p. 202.)... Præceperunt eos præpositi tantisper sic esse, donec episcopus constituatur.

[86] Ep. 11. (p. 260.) Antistes fuit

sets this matter right when he teacheth us to distinguish between an *antistes* of the first order and an *antistes* of the second; which distinction, whenever presbyters are called *antistites*, if it be not expressed, is always to be understood. Therefore Blondel argues very loosely when he would infer from this community of names and titles, that bishops and presbyters were but one and the same order; which might as well be inferred from the name *sacerdotes, priests*, which so frequently occurs in the ancient writers, and, as Cyprian observes[87], denotes an honour common both to bishops and presbyters: though when there was occasion to speak more accurately and distinctly of bishops, their appropriate title was that of *summi sacerdotes, chief priests*, to distinguish them from those of the inferior order, as I have showed before[88] in speaking of the titles of bishops: to which I shall only add here the testimony of Optatus[89], who gives both bishops, priests, and deacons, the name of *priests*, and their office the name of *priesthood;* but with this difference, that the deacons were only in the third degree of priesthood, and the presbyters in the second, but the bishops were the heads and chief of all. From whence it is plain, that if a bare community of names argued an identity of offices, one might as well infer that bishops and deacons, or presbyters and deacons, were but one and the same order, because they share in the same common title of priest and priesthood.

In what sense bishops, presbyters, and deacons called *priests* by Optatus.

15. If here it be inquired, as it is very natural to ask the question, why Optatus gives all the three orders of bishops, presbyters, and deacons, the title of *priesthood?* the answer is plain and obvious. Because, according to him every order had its share, though in different degrees, in the Christian priesthood; which is not, as some imagine, a power to offer

ordine in secundo, fratrem fasce levans episcopali.

[87] Ep. 58. [al. 61.] ad Lucium, p. 145. (p. 272.) .... Qui [presbyteri] cum episcopo sacerdotali honore conjuncti.

[88] B. 2. ch. 2. s. 6. p. 64.

[89] L. 1. p. 39. (p. 15.) Quid [commemorem] diaconos in tertio? Quid presbyteros in secundo sacerdotio constitutos? Ipsi apices et principes omnium, aliqui episcopi illis temporibus .... instrumenta divinæ legis impie tradiderunt.—Conf. Hieron. Ep. 27. [al. 108.] where he calls presbyters, *secundi ordinis sacerdotes.* [Conf. Ed. Vallars. (t. 1. p. 716 c.) Aderant Hierosolymorum et aliarum urbium episcopi et sacerdotum *inferioris gradus* ac levitarum innumerabilis multitudo. Ed.]

Christ's body and blood really upon the altar as a propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and dead: (which is such a notion of the Christian priesthood as no ancient author or ritual ever mentions: but it consists in a power and authority to minister publicly, according to God's appointment, in holy things, or things pertaining to God. And there are several parts of this power, according to the different participation of which, in the opinion of Optatus, bishops, presbyters, and deacons had each their respective share in the priesthood. Thus it was one act of the priest's office to offer up the sacrifice of the people's prayers, praises, and thanksgivings to God, as their mouth and orator, and to make intercession to God for them. Another part of the office was in God's name to bless the people, particularly by admitting them to the benefit and privilege of remission of sins by spiritual regeneration or baptism. And thus far deacons were anciently allowed to minister in holy things, as mediators between God and the people; upon which account a late learned writer[20] joins entirely with Optatus, in declaring deacons to be sharers in this lowest degree of the Christian priesthood. Above this was the power of offering up to God the people's sacrifices at the altar; that is, as Mr. Mede[21] and others explain them, first, the eucharistical oblations of bread and wine, to agnize or acknowledge God to be the Lord of the creatures: then the sacrifice of prayer and thanksgiving in commemoration of Christ's bloody sacrifice upon the cross, mystically represented in the creatures of bread and wine: which whole sacred action was commonly called the Christian's reasonable and unbloody sacrifice, or the sacrifice of the altar. Now the deacons, as we shall see in the next chapter, were never allowed to offer these oblations at the altar, but it was always a peculiar act of the presbyter's office, which was therefore reckoned a superior degree of the priesthood. Another act of the priestly office was to interpret the mind and will of God to the people; as also to bless them solemnly in his name, and upon confession and repentance

[20] Hickes, Treatise of the Christian Priesthood, ch. 2. s. 5. (p. 33.) In these divine and honourable ministrations, &c.

[21] Christian Sacrifice, ch. 2. (pp. 356, 357.)—Comp. ch. 8. (p. 373.) And after his example, &c.—Hickes, ibid. (p. 49.) with many others cited by him.

grant them ministerial absolution: and these being also the ordinary offices of presbyters, they gave them a further title to the priesthood. All these offices, and some more, the bishops[92] could perform, such as the solemn consecration or benediction of persons set apart for the ministry, &c. which, together with their spiritual jurisdiction, or power of ruling and governing the Church as vicars of Christ, gave them a title to a yet higher degree of the Christian priesthood; whence, as I noted before[93], they were called *chief priests, primi sacerdotes, summi sacerdotes, principes sacerdotum*, and *pontifices maximi*. I know, indeed, Albaspiny and several others[94] of the Roman communion make a distinction between the prelatical and sacerdotal office in a bishop, which is invented to serve some peculiar hypotheses of their own: as first, that a bishop differs nothing from a presbyter, as he is a priest; secondly, that bishop and presbyter are but one sacerdotal order; and thirdly, that the proper notion and specific character of the sacerdotal order is a power to offer Christ's body and blood as a propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and dead. All which are contrary to the plain sense of antiquity, which knew no such specific character of the sacerdotal order, nor ever dreamt of bishops and presbyters being but one order in reference to the priesthood; but always spake of them as distinct orders, and placed their distinction in their enjoying different powers of the priesthood, making presbyters only *the second order, and second priesthood,—secundus ordo et secundum sacerdotium,* —and bishops the first; and asserting that the juridical acts of a bishop were also sacerdotal, or acts of a superior degree

[92] Epiphanius calls it *ἱερουργεῖν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*. Hær. 79. Collyrid. n. 3. (t. 1. p. 1060 b.) *Οὗτοι πάντες ἐξελέγησαν ἀπόστολοι, καὶ κατὰ τὴν γῆν ἱερουργοῦντες τὸ εὐαγγέλιον κ. τ. λ.*

[93] B. 2. ch. 2. s. 6. p. 64.

[94] Bellarm. de Cler. l. 1. c. 11. (t. 2. p. 260 c.) Theologi enim solum considerant ordines, ut se habent ad sacrificium, quomodo (ut diximus) episcopus et presbyter, lector et cantor, non distinguuntur. Canonistæ autem considerant ordines, ut hierarchiam constituunt, et idcirco recte distinguunt episcopum a presbytero.—Canisius, Catechism. de Sacrament. Ord. quæst. 4. (p. 389 e.) Quamquam, quod ad ordinis sacramentum ac sacrificandi auctoritatem attinet, discrimen inter episcopos et sacerdotes non sit, tamen sunt illi sacerdotibus multo excellentiores, si ecclesiæ gubernandæ, si pascendarum animarum jus, tum baptizatos confirmandi et clericos ordinandi, potestatem consideremus.

of the Christian priesthood peculiar to his order. St. Cyprian[95] scruples not to call such acts *sacerdoti vigor, the vigour and power of the episcopal priesthood*, speaking of the power and jurisdiction which he had, as the priest of God, to punish presbyters and deacons that were under him: which he had improperly called *the power of his priesthood*, had his jurisdiction and priesthood been two different powers in him. This may serve at once to caution the reader against that subtle distinction of the Romanists, and give him a short account both of the nature and different degrees of the Christian priesthood.

16. There is another name frequently occurring in the Greek writers, when they speak of Christian priests, which will deserve to be explained: that is the name μεσῖται, *mediators between God and men*, a title given them by the author of the Constitutions[96], as also by Origen, Chrysostom, Basil, Isidore of Pelusium, and many others, whose authorities are collected by Cotelerius[97]. The Latin writers are more sparing in the use of this term: for except St. Jerom, Cotelerius could find none that used it. St. Austin is so far from using it, that he condemns it[98] as intolerable in Parmenian the Donatist, who had said, 'that the bishop was mediator between God and the people.' And indeed there is a sense in which it is intolerable to say there is any other mediator besides "one, the man Christ Jesus." But the Greek fathers used the word in a qualified sense, not for an authentic mediator, or mediator of redemption, who pleads his own merits before God in the behalf of others, but only for a mediator of ministerial intercession, in which sense some of the ancients[99] think Moses is called a

[95] Ep. 13 (al. 20.) p. 42. p. 100. Item presbyteris et diaconibus non defuit sacerdotis vigor, &c.

[96] L. 2. c. 25. Cotel. v. 1. p. 237. Ὑμεῖς τοίνυν οἱ τῶν λαικῶν ἔστε πρεσβύτεροι, διάκονοι, καὶ πρεσβύτεροι, καὶ διάκονοι, οἱ μεσῖται θεοῦ καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

[97] Cotel. ibid. n. 72. Notavi in Adversarius Origenem, &c.

[98] Cont. Parmen. l. 2. c. 8. t. 9. p. 34 d. 'St. Joannes' diceret, Mediatorem me habens apud Patrem, et ego exoro pro peccatis vestris, sicut Parmenianus quosdam loco suum episcopum, mediatorem inter populum et Deum, quis eum ferret bonorum atque fidelium Christianorum?'

[99] Basil. de Spir. Sanct. c. 14. (t. 3. part 1. p. 37 b. n. 33.) Τὸν γὰρ μεσίτην θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, δι' ἑαυτοῦ τοῦτο προσηγόρευον [al. προσηγόρευον] ἐν τῷ τοῦ νόμου διακόνῳ· οὐ γὰρ τοῦ Πνευματικοῦ τύπος ἦν Μωσῆς, τὸ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν τοῦ λαοῦ μεσιτεύων· Ἐδόθη γὰρ νόμος διατυπούς δι' ἀγγέλων ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου ἑλλαδῆ τοῦ Μωσέως) καὶ τὸν πρεσβευτὴν [al. πρόληψιν] τοῦ λαοῦ λεγόντων· Λάλησον σύ, φησί, πρὸς ἡμᾶς, καὶ μὴ λαλείτω πρὸς ἡμᾶς ὁ θεός· ἄστε ἡ εἰς αὐτὸν πίστις ἐπὶ

mediator by St. Paul, Gal. iii, 19, because he was the *internuncius* to relate the mind of God to the people, and the people's requests and resolutions to God again. And in this qualified sense it is generally owned[1] that Christian priests may be called *mediators* also, as those that are appointed to convey the people's devotions to God, and the will and blessing of God to the people.

The ancient form and manner of ordaining presbyters.

17. Having thus far spoken of the several offices and titles of presbyters, it remains that I give a short account of *the form and manner of their ordination*, by which they were invested with their power, and authorized to perform the several duties of their function. Now as to this it is plain, the ancient form was only imposition of hands and a consecration-prayer. Thus it is described in the canon of the Council of Carthage, which has been cited before[2], and in the author under the name of Dionysius[3], who represents it in this manner. He says, 'the person to be ordained kneeled before the bishop at the altar, and he, laying his hand upon his head, did consecrate him with an holy prayer, and then signed him with the sign of the cross; after which the bishop and the rest of the clergy that were present gave him the kiss of peace.' The author of the Constitutions[4] speaks also of imposition of hands and prayer, but no more. From which we may reasonably conclude, that the words which the Roman Church makes to be the most necessary and essential part of a priest's ordination, viz. 'Receive thou power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate mass both for the living and the dead,' were not in

τὸν Κύριον ἀναφέρεται, τὸν μεσίτην Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, τὸν εἰπόντα· Εἰ ἐπιστεύετε Μωυσεῖ, ἐπιστεύετε ἂν ἐμοί.—Conf. Theodor. in Gal. 3, 19. (t. 3. part 1. p. 378.) Ἐτέθη δὲ ἀγγέλων ὑπουργούντων, καὶ τῇ τούτου θέσει Μωϋσέως διακονοῦντος· αὐτὸν γὰρ μεσίτην ἐκάλεσε.

[1] See Potter, Church Government, ch. 5. p. 251. (v. 2. p. 228. towards the end of s. 2.) Some indeed, particularly St. Augustine, &c.—Conf. Cotel. in Constit. Apost. l. 2. c. 25. (v. 1. p. 237. n. 72.) Solus Christus, aiunt theologi, mediator est naturæ ac redemptionis; sacerdotes autem mediatores sunt ministerii et intercessionis.

[2] S. 10. p. 229. n. 54.

[3] De Eccles. Hierarch. c. 5. part 2. p. 364. (t. 1. p. 236 d.) Ὁ δὲ ἱερεὺς ἄμφω τὼ πόδε κλίνας ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θείου θυσιαστηρίου, ἐπὶ κεφαλῆς ἔχει τὴν ἱεραρχικὴν δεξιὰν, καὶ τούτῳ τῷ τρόπῳ πρὸς τοῦ τελοῦντος αὐτὸν ἱεράρχου ταῖς ἱεροποιοῖς ἐπικλήσεσιν ἁγιάζεται, κ. τ. λ.

[4] L. 8. c. 16. (Cotel. ibid. p. 406.) Πρεσβύτερον χειροτονῶν, ὦ ἐπίσκοπε, τὴν χεῖρα ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἐπιτίθει αὐτὸς, τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου παρεστῶτός σοι καὶ τῶν διακόνων· καὶ εὐχόμενος λέγε, κ. τ. λ.

any of the ancient forms of consecration. One of their own writers, Morinus, after the most diligent search he could make into those matters, could find no form, for 900 years together, that made any mention of them. And for their other ceremonies superadded to the old ones, other learned writers of that Church do as ingenuously confess the novelty of them. Hacomet[5] proves against Cabassutius, that material unction is a new thing, and not to be met with in any ancient ordination, as neither is it in use in the Greek Church at this day. So that when Gregory Nazianzen[7] and others speak of an unction, they are to be understood as speaking mystically of the spiritual unction of the Holy Ghost. Cabassutius[8] ob-

[5] See Bp. Burnet, Vindication of the Ordinations of the Church of England, who cites Morinus. (p. 24.) That in the primitive forms there were no express words of giving power to consecrate the sacrament, I appeal to the Collection of the most Ancient Forms of Ordination, that Morinus, a priest of that Church and a penetentiary in great esteem at Rome, has made, &c.

[6] Archerat. Observ. 2. (p. 386.) Si nulla esset unctionis ex oleo vel ex chrismate mentio in Ordine Romano; nulla in Pontificali; nulla in eorum monumentis, qui ex profesto de Ritibus Ordinationum scripsere; nulla præterea hujusce ceremoniæ in usu Ecclesiæ Romanæ tradux atque superstes consuetudo; illam, dubio procul, in ordinatione tam pontificum quam sacerdotum Latinorum usurpatam, nemo nisi divinatione quadam temeraria et cæca profiteri posset. Tale vero quidpiam occurrit circa unctionem in Ecclesia Græca; libri siquidem omnes rituales, Euchologia vulgo appellant, nullam commemorant, nedum vero præscribunt, in utraque ordinatione episcopi et sacerdotis unctionem: Euchologia dico, vel antiquissima, et illa literis priscis ac uncialibus exarata. Quod si ad antiquiora provocetur; in S. Dionysii, Areopagita ne sit, at profecto vetus est scriptor, Ecclesiastica Hierarchia, de-
[illegible]ntur satis accurate ceremoniæ
illius ordinationis hierarchiæ, diaconi, presbyteri, et episcopi seu pontificis, vel usque ad genuflexionis discrimen; de unctione ne syllaba quidem: sicut neque apud S. Maximum, antiquum illius scholiasten, qui verba formæ quæ deerant supplevit; neque apud Pachymeræ paraphrasim quidquam simile reperitur, &c.

[7] Orat. 5. (t. 1. p. 136 b.).... *Διὰ τοῦτο χρίεις τὸν ἀρχιερέα.*

[8] Notit. Concil. c. 43. (Ed. Lugdun. 1670. p. 264. Ed. Venet. 1703. p. 187.) Quinimo neque pluribus sæculis apud Latinos ipsos sub illis felicissimis sanctorum veterum Patrum sæculis, ut patet vel ex can. 5. Carthaginensis 4ti. universalis Concilii, in quo cum ducentis et ultra episcopis consedit Augustinus, adserente pro certissima ecclesiæ norma et indubitata praxi, ubi traduntur ordinis instrumenta, ibi nullam esse manus impositionem, et ita sacerdotibus et diaconis, dum ordinantur, imponi quidem manus, sed nihil eis tradi aut porrigi: at subdiaconis calicem cum patena tradi sed nullatenus imponi manus. Noster quidem Morinus contendit in suis ad Sacras Ordinationes Exercitationibus, nullam fuisse in sacerdotum et diaconum ordinationibus traditionem instrumentorum annis plusquam octingentis apud Latinos. Cæterum vir eruditionis consummatæ non advertit Ordinem Romanum, libellum ab Alcuino Caroli Magni præceptore alicubi adlegatum, ac

serves the same of the custom of delivering the sacred vessels into the hands of the person that was ordained, that however some plead very stiffly for its antiquity, yet it is really but a modern custom; and he cites Morinus for the same opinion. So that I need not stand to show the novelty of these things, which is so evidently proved, as well by the confession of these learned men, as by the silence of all ancient Rituals. But there is one thing the reader may be desirous to know further, viz. *what form of words the consecration-prayer was conceived in?* To which I must answer, as I have done before about bishops, that there was no such general form then extant; but every bishop having liberty to frame his own liturgy, he used such a form as he thought convenient in his own church: it being a thing indifferent, as a learned person[9] observes, so the substance of the blessing were preserved. The only form now remaining is that which is extant in the Constitutions; and because it will show the reader what was then the substance of the benediction, I will here insert the words of it, which are these[10]: 'Look, O Lord, upon this thy servant, who is chosen into the presbytery by the suffrage and judgment of all the clergy, and fill him with the spirit of grace and counsel, that

per consequens altioris antiquitatis, referre, in secunda parte, non solum manus ab episcopis illis imponi, qui sacerdotio initiantur, et manus inungi; sed etiam calicem cum vino aqua permixto et patenam cum pane tradi: simulque ista eis enuntiari: Accipe potestatem offerre sacrificium Deo, missamque celebrare, tam pro vivis, quam pro defunctis. [The passage is differently worded and arranged otherwise in the larger editions of the same work (Ed. Lugdun. 1680. fol. pp. 177, 178, and 1685. pp. 176, 177.) The learned Bingham makes no reference to the larger work, which suppresses some passages and amplifies others. ED.]

[9] Bp. Burnet, Vindication of the Ordinations, &c. (p. 25.) Now there being no general Liturgies and Ordinals then in the world; but every country, (or perhaps every diocese,) having their own forms; it was never defined in what form of words this prayer and benediction should be used; but was left indifferent, so the substance of the blessing were preserved.

[10] L. 8. c. 16. (Cotel. ibid. p. 407.) *Αὐτὸς καὶ νῦν ἔπιδε ἐπὶ τὸν δοῦλόν σου τοῦτον, τὸν ψήφῳ καὶ κρίσει τοῦ κλήρου παντὸς εἰς πρεσβυτέριον ἐπιδοθέντα, καὶ ἔμπλησον αὐτὸν Πνεῦμα χάριτος καὶ συμβουλίας, τοῦ ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι καὶ κυβερνᾶν τὸν λαόν σου ἐν καθαρᾷ καρδίᾳ· ὃν τρόπον ἐπίδες ἐπὶ λαὸν ἐκλογῆς σου, καὶ προσέταξας Μωϋσεῖ αἱρεῖσθαι πρεσβυτέρους οὓς ἔμπλησας Πνεύματος. Καὶ νῦν, Κύριε, παράσχου ἀνελλιπὲς τηρῶν ἐν ἡμῖν τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτός σου· ὅπως πλησθεὶς ἐνεργημάτων ἰατικῶν, καὶ λόγου διδακτικοῦ, ἐν πραότητι παιδεύῃ σου τὸν λαὸν, καὶ δουλεύῃ σοι εἰλικρινῶς ἐν καθαρᾷ διανοίᾳ καὶ ψυχῇ θελούσῃ· καὶ τὰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ ἱερουργίας ἀμώμους ἐκτελῇ διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου· μεθ' οὗ σοι δόξα, τιμὴ, καὶ σέβας, καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. ἀμήν.*

he may help and govern thy people with a pure heart; in like manner as Thou hadst respect to thy chosen people, commanding Moses to make choice of elders, whom Thou didst replenish with thy Spirit. And now, Lord, do the same thing, preserving in us the never-failing Spirit of thy grace; that he, being full of healing powers and instructive discourse, may with meekness teach thy people, and serve Thee sincerely with a pure mind and willing soul, and unblamably perform the sacred services for thy people, through Christ, &c.' Where we may observe, that it was not then thought necessary to express all or any of the offices of a presbyter in particular, but only in general to pray for grace to be given to the priest then ordained, whereby he might be enabled to perform them. And this, with a solemn imposition of hands, was reckoned a sufficient form of consecration; which I note for the instruction of those who may be apt to think that modern forms of ordination are in every circumstance like the primitive ones; whereas, if Morinus says true, the words which are now most in use, viz. "Receive the Holy Ghost," were not in the Roman Pontifical above four hundred years ago: which makes good the observation of a learned person[11], 'that the Church Catholic did never agree on one uniform ritual, or book of ordination, but that was still left to the freedom of particular Churches; and so the Church of England had as much power to make or alter rituals as any other had.

f the *archipresbyteri.*

18. I should here have ended this chapter about presbyters, but that it is necessary to give some account of the *archipresbyteri* and *seniores ecclesiæ*, which are sometimes mentioned in ancient writers. The archpresbyters are spoken of by St. Jerom[12], who seems to say there was one, and but one in every Church; and perhaps he is the first author that mentions them. After him Socrates[13] speaks of one Peter, protopresbyter of Alexandria, whom Sozomen[14] calls archpresbyter. And Liberatus[15] mentions one Proterius, archpresbyter, in the

[11] Bp. Burnet, Vindication of the Ordinations, &c. (p. 35.)

[12] Ep. 4. [al. 125.] ad Rustic. (t. 1. p. 936 c.) Singuli ecclesiarum episcopi, singuli archipresbyteri, singuli archidiaconi.

[13] L. 6. c. 9. (v. 2. p. 323. 10.) Πέτρος τὶς πρωτοπρεσβύτερος ἦν τῆς ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ἐκκλησίας.

[14] L. 8. c. 12. (ibid. p. 341. 5.)... ...Ἐπητιᾶτο Θεόφιλος τὸν τότε ἀρχιπρεσβύτερον .. ὁ δὲ Πέτρος, τοῦτο γὰρ ἦν ὄνομα αὐτῷ, κ. τ. λ.

[15] Breviar. c. 14. (CC. t. 5. p.

same Church; from whom we also learn, in some measure, what was the office and quality of the archpresbyter. He was not always the senior presbyter of the Church, as some are apt to imagine, but one chosen out of the college of presbyters, at the pleasure of the bishop: for Liberatus says expressly, that Dioscorus the bishop made Proterius archpresbyter of the Church; which implies that he did not come to the office by virtue of his seniority, but by the bishop's appointment. As to his office, it is plain from Liberatus, that it was to preside over the Church next under the bishop, as chief of the college of presbyters, and to take care of all things relating to the Church in the bishop's absence; as Proterius is said to have done, while Dioscorus went to the Council of Chalcedon. And therefore some[16], not without reason, think these *archipresbyteri* were much of the same nature with our deans in cathedral churches, as the college of presbyters were the chapter. But they wholly mistake the matter, who[17] confound these *archipresbyteri* with the *cardinales presbyteri;* for that is a name of much later date, not to be found in any genuine writer till the time of Gregory the Great: for the Council of Rome, which is the only authority that Bellarmin[18] alleges to prove it more ancient, is a mere fiction. Besides that the cardinal presbyters were many in the same church or city, but the archpresbyter was but one. So that whatever was the first original of cardinal presbyters; whether they were so called from their being fixed in some principal churches, where

763 c.).... Cui [Proterio] Dioscorus commendavit ecclesiam, qui et eum archipresbyterum fecerat.— In Editione Crabbeana male legitur *archiepiscopum*.

[16] Stillingfleet, Irenic. part. 2. ch. 7. s. 2. p. 358. (v. 2. p. 379.) Neither was this proper to Rome alone, but to all other great cities, which when the number of presbyters was grown so great, that they could not conveniently meet and join with the bishop, for ordering the government of the Church, there were some, as the chief of them, chosen out from the rest, &c.

[17] Onuphrius, Interpret. Voc. Ecclesiast. (ad calc. Platinæ, Colon. Agripp. 1622. p. 62.) Nobis præsident probati quinque seniores, &c. ... Quorum primus archipresbyter dicitur, &c.... —Salmasius, de Primat. c. 1. (p. 10.) At archipresbyteri eligebantur ac...non solum Romæ, &c.

[18] De Cler. l. 1. c. 16. (t. 2. p. 275 b.) Calvinus ... ante Gregorii tempora dicit se non legisse nomen cardinalium: et in Concilio Romano sub Sylvestro, can. 6, legimus septem fuisse diaconos cardinales in Romana Ecclesia. Præcessit autem Sylvester Gregorium annis fere trecentis: neque tamen tunc primum cœpit hoc nomen, &c.

baptism might be administered, which were therefore called *ecclesiæ vel tituli cardinales*, as Bellarmin thinks; or whether, as others[19] imagine, when the number of presbyters was grown so great in large and populous cities, that they could not conveniently meet and join with the bishop for ordering the government of the Church, there were some as the chief of them chosen out from the rest, to be as the bishop's council, who were therefore called *cardinales presbyteri*;—a dispute that does not concern me any further to inquire into or determine;—I say, whatever was their rise, or the reason of their name, it is certain they were not the same with the *archipresbyteri* of the primitive Church.

Of the seniores ecclesiastici. That these were not lay-elders in the modern acceptation.

19. As to the *seniores ecclesiæ*, they were a sort of *elders*, who were not of the clergy, yet had some concern in the care of the Church. The name often occurs in Optatus and St. Austin, from whom we may easily learn the nature of their office. Optatus says[20], when Mensurius, bishop of Carthage, was forced to leave his church in the time of the Diocletian persecution, he committed the ornaments and utensils of the church to such of *the elders as he could trust,—fidelibus senioribus commendavit*. Upon which Albaspiny[21] notes, that besides the clergy there were then some lay-elders, who were entrusted to take care of the goods of the Church. At the end of Optatus there is a tract called, The Purgation of Felix and Cæcilian, wherein there are several Epistles that make mention of the same name, as that of Fortis[22], and Purpurius, and another nameless author. St. Austin inscribes one of his Epistles[23] to his own Church of Hippo in this manner, *Clero, senioribus, et universæ plebi, To the clergy, the elders, and all the people*: and in several other places[24] [he] has occasion to mention these *seniores* in other Churches.

[19] Stillingfleet, ibid. ut supr. n. 16.

[20] L. 1. p. 41. (p. 19.)

[21] In Optat. p. 123. (p. 19. n. r.) Præter ecclesiasticos et clericos, quidam ex plebe seniores et probatæ vitæ res ecclesiæ curabant.

[22] Gest. Purgat. p. 208. ex Ep. Fortis (ad calc. Optat. p. 93 d.) Omnes episcopi, presbyteri, diaconi, seniores, scilicet, &c.—Ibid. ex Purpurii. (a.) Adhibete concle[illegible] seniores plebis, ecclesiasticos viros, et inquirant diligenter, quæ sunt istæ dissensiones.—Ibid. (a. 13.)...Clericis et senioribus Cirthensium in Domino æternam salutem.

[23] Ep. 137. [al. 78.] (t. 2. p. 182 e.) Dilectissimis fratribus, clero, senioribus, et universæ plebi ecclesiæ Hipponensis, cui servio in dilectione Christi, Augustinus in Domino salutem.

[24] Cont. Crescon. l. 3. c. 29.

From whence some[25] have concluded, that these were ruling lay-elders, according to the new model and modern acceptation. Whereas, as the ingenious author of the Humble Remonstrance rightly observes in his Reply[26], those *seniores* of the primitive Church were quite another thing. Some of them were the *optimates, the chief men* or *magistrates* of the place, such as we still call *aldermen*, from the ancient appellation of *seniores*. These are those which the Cabarsiessitan Council of Donatists, in St. Austin[27], calls *seniores nobilissimi;* and one of the Councils of Carthage[28] more expressly, *magistratus vel seniores locorum, the magistrates or elders of every city;* whom the bishops were to take with them to give the Donatists a meeting. In this sense Dr. Hammond[29] observes from Sir Henry Spelman, and some of our Saxon writings, that anciently our Saxon kings had the same title of *elders, aldermanni, presbyteri*, and *seniores;* as in the Saxon translation of the Bible, the word *princes* is commonly rendered *aldermen*. And of this sort were some of those *seniores ecclesiæ*, that have been mentioned, whose advice and assistance also no doubt the bishops took in many weighty affairs of the Church. The other sort, which were more properly called *seniores ecclesiastici*, were such as were sometimes trusted with the utensils, treasure, and outward affairs of the Church; and may be compared to our church-wardens, vestry-men, [and]

(t. 9. p. 451 e.) Silvanus a Cirta traditor est, et fur rerum pauperum, quod omnes vos episcopi, presbyteri, et diacones, et seniores scitis.—Ibid. c. 56. (p. 466 d.) Peregrinus presbyter et seniores ecclesiæ Mustitanæ regionis tale desiderium prosequuntur.

[25] Smectymnuus, or Answer to the Humble Remonstrance, s. 15. (p. 74.) By all these testimonies it is apparent, first, that in the ancient Church there were some called *seniors*. Secondly, that these seniors were not clergymen, &c.

[26] Hamon l'Estrange, Defence of the Remonstrance, or Smectymnuomastix. Lond. 1651. 8vo.

[27] Serm. in Ps. 36. p. 120. (t. 4. p. 278 d.) Nam cum incestos contra legem decretaque omnium sacerdotum communioni sanctæ adjungeret, cumque, obsistente maxima parte plebis, etiam seniorum nobilissimorum literis conveniretur, ut per se corrigeret quod admiserat, sua temeritate possessus emendare contemsit.

[28] Anno 403. in C. Afric. c. 58. et in Cod. Can. Eccles. Afric. c. 91. (t. 2. p. 1105 d.) .... Debere unumquemque nostrum in civitate sua per se convenire Donatistarum præpositos, aut adjungere sibi vicinum collegam, ut pariter eos, in singulis quibusque civitatibus vel locis, per magistratus vel seniores locorum conveniant.

[29] Dissert. 4. cont. Blondel. c. 19. n. 1. (v. 4. pp. 812, seqq.) Ad πρεσβυτέρους jam accedamus, &c.

stewards, who have some care of the affairs of the Church, but are not concerned as ruling elders in the government or discipline thereof. Now lay-elders are a degree above the deacons, but the *seniores ecclesiæ* were below them, which is a further evidence that they were not lay-elders in the modern acceptation. But of this enough. I now proceed to consider the third order of the clergy in the primitive Church, which is that of *deacons*.

CHAP. XX.

Of deacons.

icons ays rec- ied one he three ted or- s of the urch.

1. The name διάκονοι, which is the original word for *deacons*, is sometimes used in the New Testament, for *any one that ministers* in the service of God; in which large sense we sometimes find bishops and presbyters styled *deacons*, not only in the New Testament[29], but in ecclesiastical writers[30] also. But here we take it in a more strict sense for the name of the third order of the clergy of the primitive Church. In treating of which it will be necessary, in the first place, to shew the sense of antiquity concerning their original. The Council of Trullo advances a very singular notion about this matter, asserting[31], 'that the seven deacons spoken of in the Acts are not to be understood of such as ministered in divine service or the sacred mysteries, but only of such as served tables and attended the poor.' But the whole current of antiquity runs against this. Ignatius[32] styles them expressly 'ministers of

[29] Act. 1, 25. Λαβεῖν τὸν κλῆρον τῆς διακονίας ταύτης καὶ ἀποστολῆς. —2 Cor. 6, 4. Ἀλλ' ἐν παντὶ συνιστῶντες ἑαυτοὺς ὡς Θεοῦ διάκονοι. —2 Tim. 4, 5. Τὴν διακονίαν σου πληροφόρησον.—Conf. 1 Cor. 3, 5. et Eph. 3, 7.

[30] Athanas. cont. Gent. [The authority does not appear; and after the declaration of the industrious Grischovius, "semel atque iterum longam istam orationem integram perlegi, nec quidquam huc spectans invenire potui," I have considered it needless to repeat the search. In some instances my learned ancestor appears to have quoted from memory, or to have named one author or work for another. Considering the extent and number of his quotations, it is not surprising that we meet with an incidental mistake. His general precision and accuracy are admirable. Ed.]—Conf. Chrysost. Hom. 1. in Phil. 1, 1. (t. 11. p. 195 a.) Τότε γὰρ τέως ἐκοινώνουν τοῖς ὀνόμασι· καὶ διάκονος ὁ ἐπίσκοπος ἐλέγετο.

[31] C. 16. (t. 6. p. 1150 b.) Ἡμεῖς τῷ ἀποστολικῷ ῥητῷ τὸν νοῦν ἐφαρμόσαντες τῶν πατέρων, εὕρομεν, ὡς ὁ λόγος αὐτοῖς οὐ περὶ τῶν τοῖς μυστηρίοις διακονουμένων ἦν ἀνδρῶν, ἀλλὰ περὶ τῆς ἐν ταῖς χρείαις τῶν τραπεζῶν ὑπουργίας. — Ibid. (e.) . . . . Ἑπτὰ διακόνους μὴ ἐπὶ τῶν τοῖς μυστηρίοις διακονουμένων λαμβάνεσθαι.

[32] Ep. ad Trall. n. 2. (Cotel. t. 2.

the mysteries of Christ,' adding, 'that they are not ministers of meats and drinks, but of the Church of God.' In another place[33] he speaks of them as ministers of Jesus Christ, and gives them a sort of presidency over the people, together with the bishop and presbyters. 'Study to do all things,' says he, 'in divine concord, under your bishop presiding in the place of God, and the presbyters in the place of the apostolical senate, and the deacons, most dear to me, as those to whom is committed the ministry of Jesus Christ.' And in many other places[34] he requires the people to be 'subject to them, and reverence them as Jesus Christ,' that is, as his ministers attending on his service. Cyprian speaks of them in the same style, calling them[35] 'ministers of episcopacy and the Church;' withal referring their original to the place in the Acts of the Apostles, which the Council of Trullo disputes about, at the same time that he asserts[36] they were called *ad altaris ministerium, to the ministry and service of the altar.* Tertullian[37] was so far from thinking them only ministers of meats and drinks, that he joins them with bishops and priests in the honourable titles of guides and leaders of the laity, and makes them in their degree pastors and overseers of the flock of Christ. And so St. Jerom; though he sometimes in an angry humour speaks a little contemptuously of them, styling them[38]

p. 63.) *Δεῖ δὲ καὶ τοὺς διακόνους ὄντας μυστηρίων Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, κατὰ πάντα τρόπον ἀρέσκειν· οὐ γὰρ βρωτῶν* [al. *βρωμάτων*] *καὶ ποτῶν εἰσὶ διάκονοι, ἀλλ' ἐκκλησίας Θεοῦ ὑπηρέται.*

[33] Ad Magnes. n. 6. (Cotel. ibid. p. 57.) *Παραινῶ, ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ Θεοῦ σπουδάσατε πάντα πράττειν* [al. *πράσσειν*]· *προκαθημένου τοῦ ἐπισκόπου εἰς τόπον Θεοῦ, καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων εἰς τόπον συνεδρίου τῶν Ἀποστόλων, καὶ τῶν διακόνων, τῶν ἐμοὶ γλυκυτάτων, πεπιστευμένων διακονίαν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, κ. τ. λ.*

[34] Ad Polycarp. n. 6. (Cotel. ibid. p. 96.) *Ἀντίψυχον ἐγὼ τῶν ὑποτασσομένων τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, πρεσβυτέροις, διακόνοις.*—Ad Trall. n. 3. (Cotel. ibid. p. 64.) *Ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐντρέπεσθε αὐτοὺς* [*διακόνους*] *ὡς Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, κ.τ.λ.*

[35] Ep. 65. [al. 3.] ad Rogatian. (p. 173.) Diaconos post ascensum Domini in cœlos Apostoli sibi constituerunt, episcopatus sui et ecclesiæ ministros.

[36] Ep. 68. [al. 67.] ad Pleb. Legion. et Astur. p. 172. (p. 287.) ... Ne quis ad altaris ministerium, vel ad sacerdotalem locum indignus obreperet.

[37] De Fug. c. 11. (p. 540 d.) Sed quum ipsi auctores, id est, ipsi diaconi, presbyteri, et episcopi fugiunt, quomodo laicus intelligere poterit, qua ratione dictum, *Fugite de civitate in civitatem?* Itaque quum duces fugiunt, quis de gregario numero sustinebit ad gradum in acie figendum suadere.

[38] Ep. 85. [al. 146.] ad Evagr. [Evang.] (t. 1. p. 1075 a.) .. Quid patitur mensarum et viduarum minister, ut supra eos se tumidus efferat, &c.?—In Ezek. 48. (t. 5. p. 607 c.) .. Et non meminit mensarum, &c.

'ministers of widows and tables;' yet in other places[39] he treats them with greater respect, giving them the same honourable title as Tertullian does, and ranking them among the guides of the people. I shewed before in the last chapter, that Optatus[40] had so great an opinion of them, as to reckon their office a lower degree of the priesthood. And St. Austin seems to have had the same sentiments; for in one of his Epistles[41] he gives Præsidius the title of *consacerdos, his fellow priest*, whom yet St. Jerom in the next Epistle[42] calls *a deacon.*

et not generally called *priests*, but *ministers* and *levites.*

2. Yet here, that I may not seem to impose upon my readers, I must observe that the name of *priests* was not generally given to the deacons by those that esteemed them a sacred order; but they are commonly distinguished from priests by the names of *ministers* and *levites.* Thus St. Jerom[43] distinguishes them from the priests of the second order, that is from the presbyters, by the title of *levites.* The author of the Questions upon the Old and New Testament[44] under the name of St. Austin, and Hilarius Sardus[45] under the name of St. Ambrose, are more positive and express in denying them the name of priests. And though Salvian[46] acknowledges their ministration and function to be about holy things, yet he gives them but the same title of *levites*, and that in contradiction to the *priests.* And so frequently in the Councils[47] the names *sacerdos* and *levita* are used as the peculiar distinguishing titles of presbyters and deacons. The fourth Council of Carthage[48] speaks more expressly, 'that deacons are not

[39] In Mic. 7. (t. 6. p. 518 b.) Nolite credere in ducibus, non in episcopo, non in presbytero, non in diacono.

[40] See ch. 19. s. 14. p. 235. n. 89.

[41] Ep. 16. [al. 74.] (t. 2. p. 168 b.) Domino beatissimo, et merito venerando fratri et consacerdoti, Præsidio Augustinus in Domino salutem.

[42] Ep. 17. inter Epp. August. [int. Epp. Hieron. Ed. Vallars. Ep. 103.] (t. 1. p. 628 b.) Nunc quoque per sanctum fratrem meum Præsidium diaconum obsecro, &c.

[43] Ep. 27. [al. 108.] (ibid. p. 716 c.) .... Episcopi, et sacerdotum inferioris gradus, ac levitarum innumerabilis multitudo.

[44] Quæst. Vet. et Nov. Test. 46. (t. 3. append. p. 59 g.) Nunquid diaconus potest vicem gerere sacerdotis? .... Sacerdotis vicem agere non potest qui non est sacerdos.

[45] In Eph. 4. (Oper. Ambros. t. 2. append. p. 241 b.) Evangelistæ diaconi sunt, sicut fuit Philippus, quamvis non sint sacerdotes.

[46] Ad Eccles. Cathol. s. Adv. Avarit. l. 2. n. 9. (p. 239.) .... Levitis ac sacerdotibus, tanta divinarum rerum administratione fungentibus, &c.

[47] Vid. C. Turon. 1. c. 1. (t. 4. p. 1050 d.) ... Sacerdotes Dei ac levitæ, divino mancipati altario, &c.

[48] C. 4. (t. 2. p. 1200 a.) Diaconus, ... non ad sacerdotium, sed ad ministerium consecratur.

ordained to the priesthood, but only to the ministering office' or inferior service. And hence the Canons sometimes give them the name of ὑπηρέται and *ministri, the ministers* and *servants,* not only of the Church, but of the bishops and presbyters; as may be seen in the Councils of Nice[49], and Carthage[50], and many others. Whence some learned men[51] conclude against Optatus and St. Austin, that deacons were in no sense allowed to be priests: whilst others[52] with Optatus distinguish the several degrees of the priesthood, and reckon, that though deacons were not absolutely called *priests,* because that was the appropriate title of bishops and presbyters, whose ministers and attendants they were; yet deacons sometimes performed such offices, as did entitle them to a lower degree of priesthood. Having thus fairly stated and represented the matter on both sides, I must leave the judicious reader to determine for himself which opinion has the strongest reasons, whilst I proceed to give an account of the ordination of deacons, and their several offices, and such laws and rules as concerned their order.

3. The *ordination of a deacon* differed from that of a pres- For this reason the

[49] C. 18. (ibid. p. 37 c.) Ἐμμενέτωσαν οἱ διάκονοι τοῖς ἰδίοις μέτροις, εἰδότες ὅτι τοῦ μὲν ἐπισκόπου ὑπηρέται εἰσὶ, τῶν δὲ πρεσβυτέρων ἐλάττους τυγχάνουσι.

[50] Carth. 4. c. 37. (ibid. p. 1203 c.) Diaconus ita se presbyteri, ut episcopi, ministrum esse noverit.—Vid. C. Eliber. in titulo c. 18. (t. 1. p. 968 a.) De sacerdotibus et ministris, si mœchaverunt.—In titulo c. 33. (ibid. b.) De episcopis et ministris, ut ab uxoribus se abstineant.—C. Turon. 1. c. 1. (t. 4. p. 1050 b.).... Sacerdotes vel ministri ecclesiæ.

[51] Fell, Not. in Cypr. Ep. 18. [al. 12. s. 13. juxt. Pamel.] (p. 197. n. 2.) Caute hic legendus est Rigaltius, dum ait, 'esse in diaconatu sacerdotium.' Quæcumque necessitas cogit, etiam illa defendit, sed tantisper dum incubuerit. Nota est historia ap. Euseb., l. 6. c. 44., eucharistiæ per puerum Serapioni transmissæ: nemo tamen dixerit, fas esse pueris sacra illa mysteria distribuere, &c.—Habertus, Archierat. part. 8. observ. 3. (p. 125.) Duplex enim est in ecclesia munus a Christo, catholico sacerdote, ut vocat Tertullianus, institutum; τὸ ἱερατεύειν, *res sacras operari;* καὶ τὸ ἄρχεσθαι, *et gubernare seu regere:* ut optime distinguunt sancti Patres. Hoc ad episcopos et ad sacerdotes sub episcopis constitutos, illud ad sacerdotes, spectat; nec ad episcopos nisi quatenus sacerdotes, cum episcopus esse non possit, quin primo sacerdos: diaconus vero, aut hypodiaconus, aut lector, aut laicus, offerre sacrificium non potest.

[52] Rigaltius, in Cypr. Ep. 13. juxt. Pamel. [juxt. Fell, 18. al. 12.] (Prior, p. 25. n. b.—Fell, p. 197. n. 2.) Ad verba *Apud Diaconum quoque, &c.* Est enim etiam in diaconatu sacerdotium. Sic Ep. 14. p. 27. (juxt. Edit. Prior.) *Item presbyteris et diaconibus non defuit sacerdotii vigor.* At diaconos manum imponere sola necessitatis ratio admittit; nempe si urgeat exitus, et presbyter repertus non fuerit.—Dr. Hickes, Of the Christian Priesthood, (p. 33.) See ch. 19. s. 15. p. 236. n. 90.

bishop was not tied to have the assistance of any presbyters to ordain them.

byter, both in the form and manner of it, and also in the gifts and powers that were conferred thereby. For in the ordination of a presbyter, as has been noted before, the presbyters who were present were required to join in the imposition of hands with the bishop: but the ordination of a deacon might be performed by the bishop alone, because, as the Council of Carthage[53] words it, 'he was ordained not to the priesthood, but to the inferior services of the Church.' These services are not particularly mentioned in the form of ordination now remaining in the Constitutions; but there the bishop only prays in general[54], 'that God would make his face to shine upon that his servant, who was then chosen to the office of a deacon, and fill him with his Holy Spirit and power, as he did Stephen the martyr; that he, behaving himself acceptably and uniformly and unblamably in his office, might be thought worthy of a higher degree, &c.' What, therefore, were the particular offices of the deacons, we are to learn, not from the forms of the Church, but from other writers.

1. The deacon's office to take care of the utensils of the altar.

4. Where we find, first, that the most ordinary and common office of the deacons was to be *subservient and assistant to the bishop and presbyters in the service of the altar.* It belonged to them to take care of the holy table and all the ornaments and utensils appertaining thereto. The author under the name of St. Austin[55] takes notice of this as the common office of deacons in all Churches, except in such great Churches as the Church of Rome, where there being a multitude of inferior clergy, this office was devolved on some of them: but in other Churches it was the deacon's office, where the inferior clergy, subdeacons, &c. were prohibited by canon to come into

[53] C. Carth. 4. c. 4. (t. 2. p. 1200 a.) Diaconus cum ordinatur, solus episcopus, qui eum benedicit, manum super caput illius ponat: quia non ad sacerdotium, sed ad ministerium consecratur.

[54] L. 8. c. 18. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 407.) Εἰσάκουσον προσευχῆς ἡμῶν, Κύριε, ... Καὶ ἐπίφανον τὸ πρόσωπόν σου ἐπὶ τὸν δοῦλόν σου τονδὲ, τὸν προχειριζόμενόν σοι εἰς διακονίαν, καὶ πλήσον αὐτὸν Πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ δυνάμεως· ὡς ἔπλησας Στέφανον τὸν μάρτυρα καὶ μιμητὴν τῶν παθημάτων τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου· καὶ καταξίωσον αὐτὸν εὐαρέστως λειτουργήσαντα τὴν ἐγχειρισθεῖσαν αὐτῷ διακονίαν, ἀτρέπτως. ἀμέμπτως, ἀνεγκλήτως, μείζονος ἀξιωθῆναι βαθμοῦ, κ. τ. λ.

[55] Quæst. Vet. et Nov. Test. 101. (t. 3. append. p. 92 f.) Ut autem non omnia ministeria obsequiorum per ordinem agant, multitudo facit clericorum. Nam utique et altare portarent et vasa ejus, et aquam in manus funderent sacerdoti, sicut videmus per omnes ecclesias.

the sanctuary, or touch any of the sacred vessels in the time of divine service; as may be seen in several canons[56] of the ancient Councils.

5. Another part of the deacon's office was to *receive the people's offerings*, and present them to the priest, who presented them to God at the altar; after which the deacon repeated the names of those that offered publicly. And this rehearsal was commonly called *offerre nomina;* as may be seen in Cyprian[57], who speaks of it as part of the communion service of those times: which is also noted by Rigaltius[58] and others; of which custom I shall say more hereafter, when we come to treat of the ancient service of the Church. At present I only observe, that this recital of the names of such as made their oblations was part of the deacon's office, as is evident from St. Jerom, who tells us[59], 'that extortioners and oppressors made their oblations out of their ill-gotten goods, that they might glory in their wickedness, while the deacon in the church publicly recites the names of those that offered; such an one offers so

2. To receive the oblations of the people, and present them to the priest, and recite the names of those that offered.

[56] C. Agath. c. 67. (t. 4. p. 1394 b.) Non oportet in sacratos ministros licentiam habere, in secretarium, quod Græci diaconicon appellant, ingredi et contingere vasa Dominica.—C. Laod. c. 21. (t. 1. p. 1500 e.) Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ὑπηρέτας ἔχειν χώραν ἐν τῷ διακονικῷ καὶ ἁπτεσθαι δεσποτικῶν σκευῶν.—Balsamon, in loc. p. 837 a. (ap. Bevereg. Pand. t. 1. p. 462 e.) Ὑπηρέται λέγονται οἱ ὑποδιάκονοι.—Zonaras, in loc. (ap. Bevereg. ibid.) Ὑπηρέτας τοὺς ὑποδιακόνους λέγει, οὓς οὐ χρή, φησιν ὁ κανὼν, χώραν ἔχειν ἐν τῷ διακονικῷ, κ. τ. λ.

[57] Ep. 10. [al. 16.] p. 37. (p. 195.) .... Ad communicationem admittuntur, et offertur nomen eorum, et, nondum pœnitentia acta, nondum exomologesi facta, nondum manu eis ab episcopo et clero imposita, eucharistia illis datur.

[58] Not. in Cypr. Ep. 60. [al. 62.] (Prior, p. 97. n. d.—Fell, p. 275. n. 2.) Subdidi nomina singulorum non frustra, nec supervacue. Nam in sacrificiis orationum offerebantur nomina eorum, qui ad hoc opus tam necessarium promte ac libenter operati erant.—Bona, Rer. Liturg. l. 2. c. 8. n. 7. p. m. 393. (p. 296.) .... Inquirendum, quid sit hujusmodi nominum oblatio seu recitatio. Quidam putant, hoc nihil aliud fuisse quam pro illis orare, illorumque meminisse in orationibus seu publicis seu privatis. Vere tamen alicujus nomen offerre idem erat, ac ipsum in sancto sacrificio recitare et enuntiare: qui ritus manifeste colligitur ex Epistola decima Cypriani adversus presbyteros, qui lapsos, nondum peracta pœnitentia, ad consortium fidelium et ad oblationem ac perceptionem eucharistiæ admittebant: *Ad communicationem*, inquit, *admittuntur, et offertur nomen eorum, &c.*—[Ep. 16. Ed. Fell. Amstel. 1700. See the last note.]

[59] In Ezek. 18. p. 537. (t. 5. p. 209 a.).. Quod multos facere conspicimus, qui opprimunt per potentiam, vel furta committunt, ut de multis parva pauperibus tribuant, et in suis sceleribus glorientur, publicque diaconus in ecclesia recitet offerentium nomina; tantum offert ille, tantum ille pollicitus est; placentque sibi ad plausum populi, torquente eos conscientia.

much, such an one hath promised so much: and so they please themselves with the applause of the people, while their conscience secretly lashes and torments them." Some, indeed, deny that there was any such custom as this public and particular rehearsal of men's names that offered in the church, and by consequence that this was any part of the deacon's office. But I think St. Jerom's testimony is undeniable proof, and cannot otherwise be expounded, to make any tolerable sense of his words; for which reason I have made this one part of the deacon's office, though contrary to the judgment of some learned men.

d 6. In some Churches, but not in all, the deacons read the
1, Gospel, both in the Communion-service and before it also. The author of the Constitutions assigns all other parts of Scripture to the readers, but the Gospel[60] is to be read only by a presbyter or a deacon. St. Jerom[61] intimates that it was part of the deacon's function; and so it is said by the Council of Vaison, which authorizes deacons to read the Homilies of the ancient Fathers in the absence of a presbyter, assigning this reason for it[62]: 'If the deacons be worthy to read the discourses of Christ in the Gospel, why should they not be thought worthy to read the expositions of the holy Fathers?' This implies, that in the Western Churches it was the ordinary office of the deacons to read the Gospels: but in other Churches the custom varied: for, as Sozomen observes, it was customary at Alexandria for the archdeacon only to read the Gospels; in other Churches, the deacons; in others, the priests only; and in some Churches on high festivals the bishop himself read, as at Constantinople on Easter-day. In the African Churches, in the time of Cyprian, the readers were allowed to read the Gospels as well as other parts of Scripture; as appears from one of Cyprian's Epistles, where, speaking of Celerinus the confessor whom he had ordained a reader, he says[63], 'it was fitting he should be

[60] L. 2. c. 57. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 262.) ... Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα διάκονος ἢ πρεσβύτερος ἀναγινωσκέτω τὰ εὐαγγέλια, κ. τ. λ.

[61] Ep. 57. [al. 147.] ad Sabin. (t. 1. p. 1084 d.) ..... Evangelium Christi quasi diaconus lectitabas.

[62] Vasens. 2. c. 2. (t. 4. p. 1680 b.) Si digni sunt diaconi, quod Christus in Evangelio locutus est legere, quare indigni judicentur sanctorum Patrum expositiones publice recitare?

[63] Ep. 34. [al. 39.] (p. 224.) .... Quid aliud quam super pulpitum, id est, super tribunal ecclesiæ opor-

advanced to the pulpit or tribunal of the church, (as they then called the reading-desk,) that he might thence read the precepts and Gospels of his Lord, which he himself, like a courageous confessor, had followed and observed.' So that we are not to look upon this to have been the deacon's peculiar office, but only in some Churches and some ages.

7. But it was something more appropriate to them to *assist the bishop or presbyters in the administration of the eucharist;* where their business was to distribute the elements to the people that were present, and carry them to those that were absent also, as Justin Martyr[64] acquaints us in his Second Apology. The author of the Constitutions[65] likewise, describing the manner of the ancient service, divides the whole action between the bishop and the deacon; appointing the bishop to deliver the bread to every communicant singly, saying, "The body of Christ!" and the deacon in like manner to deliver the cup, saying, "The blood of Christ, the cup of life!" This the author under the name of St. Austin[66] calls the proper office of the deacons' order. Yet it was not so proper to their order, but that they were to depend upon the will and license of the bishop and the presbyters, if they were present; as is expressly provided in some of the ancient Councils[67], which forbid the deacon to give the eucharist in the presence of a presbyter, except necessity require, and he have his leave to do it. And therefore it was looked upon as a great absurdity for a presbyter to sit by and receive the sacrament from the hands of a deacon, as was sometimes practised; but the Council of Nice[68]

4. To minister the consecrated elements of bread and wine to the people in the eucharist.

tebat imponi, ut loci altioris celsitate subnixus.... legat præcepta et evangelia Domini, quæ fortiter ac fideliter sequitur.

[64] Apol. 2. (p. 97 e.) Οἱ καλούμενοι παρ' ἡμῖν διάκονοι διδόασιν ἑκάστῳ τῶν παρόντων μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος, καὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσιν ἀποφέρουσι.

[65] L. 8. c. 13. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 405.) .... Ὁ μὲν ἐπίσκοπος διδότω τὴν προσφορὰν, λέγων, Σῶμα Χριστοῦ· καὶ ὁ δεχόμενος λεγέτω, Ἀμήν· ὁ δὲ διάκονος κατεχέτω τὸ ποτήριον, καὶ ἐπιδιδοὺς λεγέτω, Αἷμα Χριστοῦ, ποτήριον ζωῆς· καὶ ὁ πίνων λεγέτω, Ἀμήν.

[66] Quæst. Vet. et Nov. Test. 101. (t. 3. append. p. 93 b.) Diaconi enim ordo est accipere a sacerdote, et sic dare plebi.

[67] C. Carth. 4. c. 38. (t. 2. p. 1203 c.) ..... Diaconus, præsente presbytero, eucharistiam corporis Christi populo, si necessitas cogat, jussus eroget.—Vid. C. Arelat. 2. c. 15. (t. 4. p. 1013 a.) .... Corpus Christi præsente presbytero tradere non præsumat.

[68] C. 18. (ibid. p. 37 b.) Ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν καὶ μεγάλην σύνοδον, ὅτι ἔν τισι τόποις καὶ πόλεσι, τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις τὴν εὐχαριστίαν οἱ διά-

made a severe canon against it. So that what was allowed to deacons was not to consecrate the eucharist, but only to distribute it, and that not to the bishop and presbyters, but only to the people. Yet this action of theirs is sometimes called *oblation* or *offering;* as in Cyprian[69] and the Council of Ancyra[70], which forbids some deacons that were under censure *ἄρτον ἢ ποτήριον ἀναφέρειν, to offer either the bread or wine,* as deacons otherwise were allowed to do.

8. Some learned persons[71], I know, put a different sense upon the words of this Council: they understand by offering *consecration*, and thence conclude that deacons anciently were invested with the ordinary power of consecrating the eucharist in the absence of the presbyters. But this is more than can fairly be deduced from the words, which are capable of two more reasonable constructions: either they may signify *the deacons' offering the people's oblations to the priest*, which was a part of their office, as I shewed before, and so Petavius[72] and Herbertus[73] understand them; or else they may be inter-

κονοι διδόασιν· ὅπερ οὔτε ὁ κανὼν, οὔτε ἡ συνήθεια παρέδωκε, τοὺς ἐξουσίαν μὴ ἔχοντας προσφέρειν, τοῖς προσφέρουσι διδόναι τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ· κἀκεῖνο δὲ ἐγνωρίσθη, ὅτι ἤδη τινὲς τῶν διακόνων καὶ πρὸ τῶν ἐπισκόπων τῆς εὐχαριστίας ἅπτονται· ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἅπαντα περιῃρήσθω, κ. τ. λ.

[69] De Lapsis, p. 132. (p. 94.) ... Ubi vero, solennibus adimpletis, calicem diaconus offerre præsentibus cœpit, &c.

[70] C. 2. (t. 1. p. 1456 d.) Διακόνους ὁμοίως θύσαντας, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἀναπαλαίσαντας, τὴν μὲν ἄλλην τιμὴν ἔχειν, πεπαῦσθαι δὲ αὐτοὺς πάσης τῆς ἱερᾶς λειτουργίας, τῆς τε τοῦ ἄρτον ἢ ποτήριον ἀναφέρειν, ἢ κηρύσσειν.

[71] Hospinian, Hist. Sacrament. l. 2. c. 1. (p. 23.) In Synodo quoque Ancyrana sanctum legimus in hunc modum: *Diaconi, qui immolaverunt,* (nimirum in persecutione,) *honorem quidem habeant*, &c. Illo ergo adhuc tempore diaconi eucharistiam administrabant. Refert etiam Theodoretus, ut supra quoque adnotavimus, l. 4. Historiæ, c. 12, Cum Valens Imp. Arrianus omnes sacerdotes suis sedibus ejiceret, Eusebium episcopum Samosatenum militari habitu omnia illa loca percurrisse, et clam presbyteros et diaconos ordinasse, ne plebs sacramentis careret. Has autem diaconorum partes postea multa decreta resciderunt et antiquarunt. Nam in Concilio Arelatensi apud Gallos celebrato constituitur, *Ne diaconi omnino sacramentum administrent*, &c.

[72] De Potest. Consecrand. &c. c. 3. t. 4. p. 211. (t. 6. p. 8.) ..... Neque fœminas neque inferiores sacerdote clericos consecrasse unquam, &c.

[73] Archierat. part. 9. observ. 2. (p. 190.) *Panem vel calicem offerre.* Sed quid hoc? offerre idem ne hic ac consecrare? Multum abest, siquidem duplici functione diaconi, panem vel calicem attingendo utrumque offerre absque consecratione, dici potuerunt; uno quidem modo laicis utrumque porrigendo, quod quidem *offerre* dicitur S. Cypriano, libro de Lapsis, uti apte, suo more, nuper adnotavit Dion. Petavius. Sed hunc modum nunc prætermissum velim. Alter mihi modus, etiam in Petavium antequam inciderem, sem-

preted by Cyprian's words, who expresses himself more fully, calling it 'offering the consecrated bread and wine to the people;' which seems to be the most natural sense, and is preferred to all others by some late learned writers[74]. Whatever it be, there is no reason to believe it means that *deacons were allowed the ordinary power of consecration;* for the Council of Nice, which was not long after the Council of Ancyra, says expressly[75], that deacons had not power to offer, that is, in the sense in which offering signifies *consecration;* for in that sense it was the proper office of presbyters. Some deacons indeed did about this time take upon them thus to offer, but the Council of Arles, which was held in the same year with that of Ancyra, reckons it a presumption and transgression of their rule, and therefore made a new canon[76] to restrain them. St. Hilary is a good witness of the practice of the Church in his own time, and he[77] assures us 'there could be no sacrifice or consecration of the eucharist without a presbyter.' And St. Jerom says the same[78], 'that presbyters were the only persons whose prayers consecrated bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ.' For which reason, speaking of one Hilary a deacon, he says[79], 'he could not consecrate the eucharist because he was only a deacon.' The reason of this was, because

per arrisit; quo nempe diaconus offerre dicitur panem vel calicem, non consecrando, sed utrumque sacerdoti consecraturo repræsentando: quod eo aptius ἀναφέρειν dicitur, quo certe diaconus ex manibus populi munera illa primum suscipiebat, ad sacerdotem vel episcopum referenda, vel ei una cum sacerdotibus in usum eucharisticæ consecrationis, quod æquum erat, excerpturo eadem, exhibeant.

[74] Suicer. Thes. Eccles. in voce, Διάκονος, β. (t. 1. p. 871.) Calicem et panem in sacra eucharistia ministrabant populo. Patet ex Justini Martyris Apol. 2. p. 162. Οἱ καλούμενοι, κ. τ. λ. (See s. 7. n. 64, preceding.)—Cyprian. Serm. 5. De Lapsis: 'Ubi solennibus, &c. (See n. 69, preceding.) — Idem colligitur ex can. 2. Ancyrano: ibi enim de diaconis immolantibus, postea autem reluctantibus decernitur, eos quidem honorem suum retinere, πεπαῦσθαι δὲ, κ. τ. λ. (See afterwards s. 10. p. 260. n. 1.) Ergo ante lapsum hoc faciebant.

[75] C. 18. (t. 2. p. 37 c.) Τοὺς ἐξουσίαν μὴ ἔχοντας προσφέρειν, κ. τ. λ.

[76] Arelat. 1. c. 15. (t. 1. p. 1428 e.) De diaconibus, quos cognovimus multis locis offerre, placuit minime fieri debere.

[77] Fragm. p. 129. [juxt. Ed. Veron. 1730. (p. 633 c. 1.) fragm. 2.] Porro autem sacrificii opus sine presbytero esse non potuit.

[78] Ep. 85. [al. 146.] ad Evagr. [Evang.] (t. 1. p. 1075 a.) Quid patitur mensarum et viduarum minister, ut supra eos tumidus se efferat, ad quorum preces Christi corpus et sanguis conficitur?

[79] Dial. cont. Lucifer. p. 145. (t. 2. p. 194 c.) Hilarius cum diaconus de ecclesia recesserit, solusque, ut putat, turba sit mundi; neque eucharistiam conficere potest, episcopos et presbyteros non habens, &c.

the holy eucharist was looked upon as the prime Christian sacrifice, and one of the highest offices of the Christian priesthood; and deacons being generally reckoned no priests, or but in the lowest degree, they were therefore forbidden to offer or consecrate this sacrifice at the altar. This reason is assigned by the author of the Constitutions[80], and the author under the name of St. Austin[81], and several others.

But there is a passage in St. Ambrose[82] which seems to intimate, that in the third century the deacons at Rome had power to consecrate the eucharist. For, speaking of Laurentius the deacon, he brings him in thus addressing himself to Sixtus his bishop, as he was going to his martyrdom: 'Whither go you, holy priest, without your deacon? you did not use to offer sacrifice without your minister: why are you then now displeased with me? why may I not be partner with you in shedding my blood, who was used to consecrate the blood of Christ by your commission, and be your partner in consummating the holy mysteries?' Baronius was so perplexed with this difficulty, that he resolves it to be a corruption of the text, and that instead of '*consecrationem*,' it should be read[83] '*dispensationem*:' and some shameless editors have, without any grounds, made bold to foist this correction into the text: which Bona[84]

[80] L. 8. c. 28. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 411.) *Διάκονος οὐκ εὐλογεῖ· οὐ δίδωσιν εὐλογίαν· λαμβάνει δὲ παρὰ ἐπισκόπου καὶ πρεσβυτέρου· οὐ βαπτίζει· οὐ προσφέρει· τοῦ δὲ ἐπισκόπου προσενεγκόντος ἢ τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου, αὐτὸς ἐπιδίδωσι τῷ λαῷ, οὐχ ὡς ἱερεὺς, ἀλλ' ὡς διακονούμενος ἱερεῦσι.*

[81] Quæst. Vet. et Nov. Test. 46. (t. 3. append. p. 59 g.) Et qui non fuit sacerdos, quomodo vicem agere poterat sacerdotis? Numquid diaconus potest vicem agere sacerdotis? Præfectus etenim potest agere vicem præfecti, et prætor prætoris: non tamen privatus potest vicem agere potestatis alicujus: quanto magis sacerdotis vicem agere non potest, qui non est sacerdos?

[82] De Offic. l. 1. c. 41. (t. 2. p. 54 f.).. Quo, sacerdos sancte, sine diacono properas tuo? Nunquam sacrificium sine ministro offerre consueveras. Quid in me ergo displicuit, pater? Cui commisisti dominici sanguinis consecrationem? Cui consummandorum consortium sacramentorum? Huic consortium tu sanguinis [al. huic sanguinis tui consortium] negas?

[83] An. 261. n. 7. (t. 2. p. 550 c.) .... Cui commisisti dominici sanguinis dispensationem? &c.

[84] Rer. Liturg. l. 1. c. 25. n. 4. (p. 260.) Hoc item sensu dixisse existimo Sixto pontifici Laurentium diaconum apud Ambrosium, (l. 1. Offic. c. 41.) *Experire certe, utrum idoneum ministrum elegeris, cui commisisti dominici sanguinis consecrationem.* Sic enim scriptum est in antiquis codicibus tam editis quam MSS., non '*dispensationem*,' ut in vulgatis libris correctum est. Huic autem lectioni, nullatenus formidandæ aut corrigendæ, sed omnino restituendæ, favet contextus, nam consequitur, '*Cui consummandorum*,' &c.?

and Habertus[85] ingenuously condemn, as done against the authority of all the MSS. as well as former editions, and that without any reason for it from the difficulty of the expression. For the word *consecration* in this place does not signify the sacramental consecration of the element by prayer at the altar, which was performed by the bishop himself; as appears evidently from the context, where it is said 'the bishop was never used to offer sacrifice without his minister or deacon:' therefore the consecration, which was committed to the deacon, must be of another sort; for he could not offer or consecrate the elements on the altar in the bishop's presence, and at the same time that the bishop himself consecrated: but he might assist him, or bear a part with him, as it is there worded, in consummating the holy mysteries, that is, in giving the cup with the usual form of words to the people: which in the language of those times was called *a ministerial consecration* or *consummation of the sacrament*, forasmuch as the receivers were hereby consecrated with the blood of Christ, and also consummated or made perfect partakers of the sacrament in both kinds, having received the bread from the hands of the bishop, and the cup from the hands of the deacon. This is plainly the consecration here spoken of, which refers only to the deacon's ministering of the cup to the people, which was their usual office, and so cannot be made an argument, as Hospinian and Grotius[86] would have it, that deacons were allowed to consecrate the eucharist at the altar.

5. Deacons allowed to baptize, in some places.

9. But for the other sacrament of baptism, it is more evident that they *were permitted in some cases to administer it solely.* For though the author of the Constitutions says[87] 'that the deacons did neither baptize nor offer,' and Epiphanius[88] affirms universally 'that the deacons were not intrusted with the sole administration of any sacrament,' yet it appears from other

[85] Archierat. part. 9. observ. 2. (p. 191.) Scio Cardinalem Baronium legere *dispensationem*. Sed verum est, veterum exemplaria, veteres editiones *consecrationem* habere.

[86] De Cœnæ Administratione ubi Pastores non sunt.—(Oper. Grot. t. 3. p. 508. 7.) Cited and confuted by Petavius. Eucharistiæ ritum, &c. —Petavius, de Potestate consecrandi, &c. c. 3. (t. 6. p. 9.) Quo ex canone liquet, quantopere hallucinatus sit auctor Dissertationis, &c.

[87] L. 8. c. 28. See s. 8. p. 256. n. 80.

[88] Hæc. 79. Collyrid. n. 4. (t. 1. p. 1061 a.) Καὶ γὰρ οὔτε διάκονοι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησιαστικῇ τάξει ἐπιστεύθησάν τι μυστήριον ἐπιτελεῖν, ἀλλὰ μόνον διακονεῖν τὰ ἐπιτελούμενα.

writers that they had this power, at least in some places, ordinarily conferred upon them. Tertullian[89] invests them with the same right as presbyters, that is, to baptize by the bishop's leave, and St. Jerom[90] entitles them to the very same privilege. The Council of Eliberis[91] as plainly asserts this right, when it says, 'If a deacon, that takes care of a people without either bishop or presbyter, baptizes any, the bishop shall consummate them by his benediction.' This plainly supposes that deacons had the ordinary right of baptizing in such Churches over which they presided. So when Cyril[92] directs his catechumens how they should behave themselves at the time of baptism, when they came either before a bishop or presbyter or deacon, in city or in village,—this may be presumed a fair intimation that then deacons were ordinarily allowed to minister baptism in country places. I speak only now of their ordinary power; for as to extraordinary cases, not only deacons, but the inferior clergy and laymen also were admitted to baptize in the primitive Church, as will be shewed in its proper place.

Deacons aid prayer the congregation.

10. Another office of the deacons was to be *a sort of monitors and directors to the people* in the exercise of their public devotions in the church; to which purpose they were wont to use certain known forms of words to give notice when each part of the service began, and to excite the people to join attentively therein: also to give notice to the catechumens, penitents, energumens, when to come up and make their prayers, and when to depart: and in several prayers they repeated the words before them, to teach them what they were to pray for. All this was called by the general name of κηρύττειν among the Greeks, and *prædicare* among the Latins; which does not ordinarily signify *preaching*, as some mistake it, but performing the office of a κῆρυξ, or *præco*, in the assembly:

[89] De Bapt. c. 17. (p. 230 c.) Dandi quidem habet jus summus sacerdos, qui est episcopus; dehinc presbyteri et diaconi, non tamen sine episcopi auctoritate, propter ecclesiæ honorem.

[90] Dial. cont. Lucifer. c. 4. p. 139. (t. 2. p. 182 a.) Inde venit, ut sine jussione episcopi neque presbyter neque diaconus jus habeant baptizandi.

[91] C. 77. (t. 1. p. 978 e.) Si quis diaconus, regens plebem sine episcopo vel presbytero, aliquos baptizaverit, episcopus eos per benedictionem perficere debebit.

[92] Catech. 17. n. 17. [al. 35.] (p. 281 d.) . . . . Κατὰ γὰρ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦ βαπτίσματος, ὅταν προσέλθῃς ἐνὶ τῶν ἐπισκόπων, ἢ πρεσβυτέρων, ἢ διακόνων, κ. τ. λ.

whence Synesius[93] and some others call the deacons ἱεροκήρυκες, *the holy criers* of the Church, as those that gave notice to the congregation how all things were regularly to be performed. Thus the word κηρύξαι frequently occurs in the ancient rituals and canons; as in the Apostolical Constitutions[94], as soon as the bishop has ended his sermon, the deacon is to cry, 'Let the hearers and unbelievers depart.' Then he is to bid the catechumens pray, and to call upon the faithful also to pray for them, repeating a form of bidding prayer to instruct the people after what manner they were to pray for them; which form may be seen both in the Constitutions[95] and in St. Chrysostom[96]. After this the deacon was to call in like manner upon the energumens, the *competentes*, and the penitents, in their several orders, using the solemn words of exhortation both to them and the people to pray for them, Ἐκτενῶς δεηθῶμεν· *Let us ardently pray for them!* Then again, when the deacon had dismissed all these by a solemn cry, Ἀπολύεσθε, προέλθετε· or, *Ite, missa est!* he called upon the faithful to pray again for themselves and the whole state of Christ's Church, repeating[97] another form of bidding prayer before them. And this is there called the deacon's προσφώνησις, or *exhortation to pray*, to distinguish it from the bishop's ἐπίκλησις, which was a direct form of address to God, whereas the deacon's address was to the people; for which reason it was called προσφώνησις and κηρύξαι, *bidding the people to pray*, or, *a call and exhortation to pray*, with directions what they should pray for in particular. This the Latins call both *oratio* and *prædicatio*, as may be seen in one of the Councils of Toledo[98], which ex-

[93] Ep. 67. p. 224. (p. 209 a. 11.) Κατεστιγαζόντων δὲ τῶν ἱεροκηρύκων, εἰς θρῆνον αὐτοῖς ἀπετελεύτησεν ἡ βοή.—Conf. Chrysost. Hom. 17. in Hebr. 9. (t. 12. p. 171 b.) Ἔστηκε τοίνυν καὶ νῦν ὁ παρ' ἡμῖν κήρυξ... ὅταν γὰρ εἴπῃ, Τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις, κ. τ. λ.

[94] L. 8. c. 5. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 392.) .... Καὶ πληρώσαντος αὐτοῦ τὸν τῆς διδασκαλίας λόγον .... ἀναστάντων ἁπάντων ὁ διάκονος ἐφ' ὑψηλοῦ τινος ἀνελθὼν κηρυττέτω· Μή τις τῶν ἀκροωμένων· μή τις τῶν ἀπίστων· καὶ ἡσυχίας γενομένης, λεγέτω·—C. 3. (ibid.) Εὔξασθε οἱ κατηχούμενοι, καὶ πάντες οἱ πιστοὶ κατὰ διάνοιαν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν προσευχέσθωσαν.

[95] Ibid. c. 6. tot. (Cotel. ib. p. 393.) Κύριε, ἐλέησον, κ. τ. λ.

[96] Hom. 2. in 2 Cor. (t. 10. p. 435 b.) Ὅταν γὰρ ὁ διάκονος λέγῃ, κ. τ. λ.

[97] Vid. Constit. Apost. l. 8. c. 10. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 396.) Ὑπὲρ τῆς εἰρήνης, κ. τ. λ.

[98] Tolet. 4. c. 40. (t. 5. p. 1716 c.) Unum orarium oportet levitam gestare in sinistro humero, propter quod orat, id est, prædicat.

plains the word *orare* by *prædicare*, making them both to signify this office of the deacon. And hence one of the deacon's ornaments (that I may note this by the way) is called by the same Council his *orarium;* because he used it sometimes as a private signal to give notice of the prayers to his brethren of the clergy. By all this we may understand what Socrates means, when he says[99] Athanasius commanded his deacon κηρύξαι εὐχὴν, *to bid prayer;* and how we are to interpret that controverted canon[1] of the Council of Ancyra, which, speaking of some deacons that had lapsed into idolatry, and degrading them, says, they should no longer κηρύσσειν, which some interpret *preaching;* but others[2] more truly understand it of this part of the deacon's office, which was to be the κήρυξ or *præco, the sacred crier of the congregation.*

Deacons lowed to each by e bishop's thority.

11. If it be inquired whether deacons had any power to preach publicly in the congregation?—the answer must be the same as in the case of baptism: they had *power to preach by license and authority from the bishop*, but not without it. The author under the name of St. Ambrose[3] says positively, that

[99] L. 2. c. 11. (v. 2. p. 89. 27.)... Προστάξας διακόνῳ κηρύξαι εὐχήν.

[1] C. 2. (t. 1. p. 1456 d.).... Πεπαῦσθαι δὲ αὐτοὺς πάσης τῆς ἱερᾶς λειτουργίας, τῆς τε τοῦ ἄρτον ἢ ποτήριον ἀναφέρειν, ἢ κηρύσσειν.

[2] Habertus, Archierat. part. 9. observ. 5. (p. 203.)..... Eo canone [Ancyr. 2.] κηρύσσειν *concionari*, quod vulgo *prædicare* dicimus, minime significat, sed *pronuntiare, annuntiare* ea, de quibus uno aut altero verbo populum inter sacra admonebat diaconus, ut κήρυξ, *præco* ecclesiæ, vel episcopi aut presbyteri sacrificantis. — Bevereg. Not. in C. Ancyr. c. 2. (t. 2. append. p. 174.) Hic observetur discrimen inter presbyterorum et diaconorum officia. In primo enim canone presbyteros quidem προσφέρειν καὶ ὁμιλεῖν, in præsenti autem diaconos ἀναφέρειν καὶ κηρύσσειν, dictum est: ut igitur ἀναφέρειν a προσφέρειν, sic etiam κηρύσσειν ab ὁμιλεῖν, distinguatur necesse est. Cum ὁμιλεῖν igitur isto loco *concionari, sive sermonem habere* significet; κηρύσσειν hoc loco, de diaconis dictum, nihil aliud denotare videtur, quam quod proprie significat, *præconis* scilicet *officio fungi*. Hoc enim in sacris celebrandis diacono olim incubuit, alta nimirum voce et præconis instar varios ritus et ordinem per totam liturgiam moderari, et significare quid et quando a fidelibus aut catechumenis orandum erat. — Suicer. Thes. Eccles. in voce κηρύσσω. (t. 2. p. 99.) Κηρύσσειν.... diaconis tributum, non significat *verbum prædicare* sed illud declarat ministerium, quo, dato orarii signo, actionum sacrarum ritus et ordinem moderabantur.—[Conf. Justel. ad eund. can. C. Ancyr. (t. 1. p. 76) Κηρύσσειν. Socrates, l. 6. c. 11, de Athanasio loquens, &c.—Item Suicer. in voce κατηχέω. B. (t. 2. ad calc. p. 73 et p. 74.) Licet enim in sacerdote κηρύττειν ὁμιλεῖν et εὐαγγελίζεσθαι significet, in diaconis illud ministerium declarat, quo, dato orarii signo, actionum sacrarum ritus et ordinem moderabantur. Ed.]

[3] In Eph. 4. (Oper. Ambros. t. 2. append. p. 241 t.).... Nunc neque diaconi in populo prædicant, neque clerici vel laici baptizant.

deacons did not preach in his time; though he thinks originally all deacons were evangelists, as Philip and Stephen were. I have shewed before that presbyters themselves, in many places, were not allowed to preach in the bishop's presence but by his special leave; and therefore it is much more reasonable to conclude the same of deacons. Blondel[4] and Baronius[5] think that St. Chrysostom preached those elegant discourses, *De incomprehensibili Dei Natura, De Anathemate, &c.* while he was but a deacon; but others[6] think, more probably, that those were not sermons which he preached in the church, but only discourses that he composed upon other occasions; and that his first sermon was that which he preached when he was ordained presbyter, now extant in his fourth vol. p. 953. [Ed. Bened. t. 1. p. 436. Ed. Savil. t. 6. p. 443.] But if he ever preached while he was deacon, there is no question to be made but that he had the authority of his bishop, Meletius, for doing it; as Philostorgius[7] says Leontius, the Arian bishop of Antioch, permitted Aëtius, his deacon, to preach publicly in the church. Ephrem Syrus perhaps was another such instance,

[4] Apol. s. 2. Observand. ad n. 21. 18. (p. 57.) Quod Hilarius suo tempore *diaconos in populo non prædicasse* observavit, generale non fuit: nam eodem fere tempore, Meletio præsente, Antiochiæ De Incomprehensibili, &c. eloquentissimas in diaconatu conciones habuit Joannes cognomento Chrysostomus.

[5] An. 386. n. 55. (t. 4. p. 542 c.) Cum primum vero presbyter designatus est, primam omnium ad populum habuisse dicitur homiliam, cujus est exordium, 'Num vera sunt quæ nobis acciderunt'.... At nihil ibi de presbyteratu, sed de suscepta tantum docendi populi functione: quam quidem non ante hunc annum auspicatum fuisse, ex eo exploratum redditur; dum ipse in una illarum orationum, quas habuit ad populum Antiochenum de imminente clade ob statuas ignominia affectas, quod certum est contigisse post sequentem annum, expresse testatur se jam in docendi munere biennium agere. Sunt hæc ejus verba; 'Ecce, secundum hunc annum habeo vestræ disserens caritati,'.... Quamobrem in eam sententiam ire compellimur, ut quæ reperiuntur scriptæ orationes ab ipso, cum diaconus esset, nempe superius recensitæ adversus Gentiles, Judæos, atque Hæreticos, et de Anathemate, eas speciali indulgentia et jussione Flaviani pro concione dixerit; cessasse vero postea usque ad presbyteratum.

[6] Cave, Hist. Liter. (v. 1. p. 253.) Diaconus constitutus ad scribendum se accinxit; librosque *Adversus Judæos, Gentiles, Anomæos, De Sacerdotio, De Providentia ad Stagirium Monachum,* aliosque aliquot edidit. Exacto in diaconatu quinquennio, a Flaviano, nam falsus est Socrates qui ab Evagrio factum refert, anno 386, ecclesiæ Antiochenæ presbyter factus est, quo tempore primam concionem habuit quæ exstat t. 4. p. 953. [juxt. Ed. Ducæan. Par. 1616.]

[7] L. 3. c. 17. (v. 3. p. 499. 6.)... *Λεόντιος.... εἰς διακονίαν τὸν μαθητὴν προχειρίζεται, καὶ διδάσκειν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ τὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπιτρέπει δόγματα.*

dangerous distemper, they need not expect my return, but may have recourse to any presbyter that is present; or, if a presbyter cannot be found, they may make their confession before a deacon; that so they may receive imposition of hands, and go to the Lord in peace.' Here it is observable, that none below a deacon are commissioned to perform this office; nor were the deacons authorized to do it but as the bishop's delegates, and that in cases of extreme necessity, when no presbyter could be found to reconcile the penitent at the point of death.

And to suspend the inferior clergy in some extraordinary cases.

In the like case, that is, in the case of absolute necessity, it seems very probable that in some of the Greek Churches they had *power to suspend the inferior clergy*, when need so required, and neither bishop nor presbyter was present to do it; which may be collected from those words of the author of the Constitutions, where[13] he says, 'A deacon excommunicates a subdeacon, a reader, a singer, a deaconess, if there be occasion, and the presbyter be not at hand to do it. But a subdeacon shall have no power to excommunicate any, either clergy or laity; for subdeacons are only ministers of the deacons.' This was a power then committed to deacons in extraordinary cases, and a peculiar privilege which none of the inferior clergy might enjoy.

9. Deacons to attend upon their bishops, and sometimes represent them in general councils.

13. It may be reckoned also among their extraordinary offices, that they were sometimes deputed by their bishops to be their representatives and proxies in general councils. Their ordinary office there was only to attend upon their bishops, and perform the duties of scribes and disputants, &c., according as they were directed by them; in which station we commonly find them employed in the ancient councils. But then there were two things in which they were treated as inferior to presbyters: first, in that presbyters are usually represented as sitting together with their bishops, while the deacons stood with all the people. Secondly, presbyters were sometimes allowed to vote, as has been shewed before; but there are no

cere delicti sui possint; ut, manu eis in pœnitentia imposita, veniant ad Dominum cum pace.

[13] L. 8. c. 28. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 411.) *Διάκονος ἀφορίζει ὑποδιάκονον, ἀναγνώστην, ψάλτην, διακόνισσαν· ἐὰν ᾖ τι τοιοῦτον, μὴ παρόντος πρεσβυτέρου· ὑποδιακόνῳ οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἀφορίσαι, οὔτε μὴν ἀναγνώστην, οὔτε ψάλτην, οὔτε διακόνισσαν, οὐ κληρικὸν, οὐ λαϊκόν· ὑπηρέται γάρ εἰσι διακόνων.*

instances, that I know of, to evidence the same privilege to belong to deacons. Only when bishops could not attend in person, they many times sent their deacons to represent them: and then they sat and voted, not as deacons, but as proxies, in the room and place of those that sent them; of which there are so many instances in the Acts of the Councils, that it is needless to refer the reader to any of them. Yet they that desire to see examples may consult Christianus Lupus[14] in his Notes upon the seventh canon of the Council of Trullo, where he observes some difference in the sitting and voting of deacons in the Eastern and Western Councils. In the Eastern Councils, if a deacon represented a metropolitan or a patriarch, he sat and subscribed in the place that the metropolitan or patriarch himself would have done, had he been present; but in the Western Councils it was otherwise; there the deacons voted after all the bishops, and not in the place of those whose proxies they were.

Thus it was in general councils. But in provincial and consistorial synods the deacons were sometimes allowed to give their voice, as well as the presbyters, in their own name. Of which the reader may see several instances in the Roman Councils, under Symmachus and Gregory II., published by Justellus[15] in his *Bibliotheca Juris Canonici*, and in the fourth tome of the Councils, where first the bishops, then the presbyters, and then the deacons subscribe, every one in their own name in particular. And those that are curious about this matter may furnish themselves with many other such examples.

. Deacons ıpowered rebuke d correct ɔn that haved ɔmselves egularly the urch.

14. There are two things more to be observed concerning the office of deacons in church-assemblies: first, that as they were the regulators and directors of men's behaviour in divine service, so they had *power to rebuke the irregular*, and chastise them for any indecent and unseemly deportment. The Constitutions often mention[16] such acts as these belonging to the deacon's office. 'If any one be found sitting out of his place,

[14] [Schol. in c. 7. C. Trull. (t. 3. p. 64.) Antiquam et variam diaconorum superbiam, &c. ED.]

[15] See before, ch. 19. s. 12. p. 231. n. 64, seqq.

[16] L. 2. c. 57. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 263.) *Εἰ δέ τις εὑρεθῇ παρὰ τόπον καθεζόμενος, ἐπιπλησσέσθω ὑπὸ τοῦ διακόνου ὡς πρωρέως, καὶ εἰς τὸν καθήκοντα αὐτῷ τόπον μεταγέσθω.*

let the deacon rebuke him, and transfer him to his proper station, as the pilot or steersman of the Church.' And again, a little after[17], 'Let the deacon overlook and superintend the people, that no one talk, or sleep, or laugh, but give ear to the word of God.' This is evident also from St. Chrysostom[18], who, speaking of the irreverent behaviour of some in the church, bids their neighbours first rebuke them, and if they would not bear it, to call the deacon to do his office towards them. Agreeable to this, Optatus[19] tells us a very remarkable story of Cæcilian, archdeacon of Carthage; 'that, observing one Lucilla, a rich woman, commit an indecent act in the time of receiving the holy communion, (for before she received the bread and wine she was used to kiss the relics of some pretended martyr,) he rebuked her for it by virtue of his office; which she so highly resented, that afterward, when he was chosen bishop, she factiously withdrew herself with some others from his communion, and pretending his ordination to be illegal, she by her power got Majorinus ordained against him.' And this was one of the principal causes of the schism of the Donatists, as Optatus there observes. It had its rise from the implacable malice of a proud and angry woman, who could never forgive the deacon that rebuked her in the church. Some may perhaps imagine, that what Cæcilian did was by virtue of a superior office, and that, as archdeacon, he was of an higher order, as now commonly archdeacons are. But I shall shew in the next chapter that anciently archdeacons were always of the order of deacons, and of no other degree: and it appears from what has here been already discoursed, that this act of Cæcilian was not from any peculiar power that he en-

[17] Ibid. (p. 264.) Ὁμοίως ὁ διάκονος ἐπισκοπείτω τὸν λαὸν, ὅπως μή τις ψυθιρίσῃ, ἢ νυστάξῃ, ἢ γελάσῃ, ἢ νεύσῃ· χρὴ γὰρ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐπιστημόνως, καὶ νηφαλέως, καὶ ἐγρηγορότως ἱστάναι, ἐκτεταμένην ἔχοντα τὴν ἀκοὴν ἐπὶ τὸν τοῦ Κυρίου λόγον. —[Conf. l. 8. c. 11. (p. 398.)...Καὶ διάκονος αὐτοῖς ἕτερος ἔστω ἐφεστὼς, ὅπως μὴ ἀτακτῶσι, κ. τ. λ.]

[18] Hom. 24. in Act. (t. 9. p. 198 d.) ....Κεῖνται πάντες νέοι ψυχροὶ καὶ γέροντες· καθάρματα μᾶλλον ἢ νέοι, γελῶντες, ἀνακαγχάζοντες, διαλεγόμενοι· καὶ γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο ἤκουσα γινόμενον· καὶ ἀλλήλους σκώπτοντες ἐπὶ γόνατα κείμενοι· σὺ παρέστηκας ὁ νέος ἢ ὁ πρεσβύτης ἐπίπληξον, ἂν ἴδῃς· ἐγκάλεσον σφοδρότερον οὐκ ἀνεχόμενον, τὸν διάκονον κάλεσον, κ. τ. λ.

[19] L. 1. p. 40. (p. 18.) Cum correptionem archidiaconi Cæciliani ferre non posset, [Lucilla,] quæ ante spiritalem cibum et potum, os nescio cujus martyris, si tamen martyris, libare dicebatur, &c.

joyed as archdeacon, but from that ordinary power to rebuke offenders, which he had in common with all the other deacons of the Church.

15. The other thing I would further remark concerning the office of deacons is this, that before the institution of the inferior orders of the Church, (which were not set up in all Churches at once, nor perhaps in any Church for the two first ages, as shall be shewed hereafter,) the deacons were employed to perform all such offices as were, in after-ages, committed to those orders: such as the offices of readers, subdeacons, exorcists, or catechists, door-keepers, and the like. Thus Epiphanius[20] observes, that originally all offices of the Church were performed by bishops, presbyters, and deacons, and therefore no Church was without a deacon. This was certainly the practice in the time of Ignatius, who never speaks of any order below that of deacons: but 'without them,' he says[21], 'no Church was called a Church.' So that all the inferior offices must then be performed by deacons. And even in after-ages we find that several of the inferior offices were many times put upon the same man; perhaps to avoid the charge of maintaining an over-numerous clergy in lesser Churches. Thus Eusebius tells us[22], that Romanus the martyr was both deacon and exorcist in the Church of Cæsarea. And Procopius the martyr had three offices in the Church of Scythopolis; he was at once reader, interpreter, and exorcist, as we learn from the Acts of his Martyrdom[23], published by Valesius. Now both these were martyred in the beginning of the fourth century, in the time of the Diocletian persecution. And we find a whole age after this, if the author under the name of St. Austin[24] may be credited, that except in such great and rich Churches as the Church of Rome, where there was a numerous clergy, all the

[20] Hær. 75. Aerius, n. 5. (t. 1. p. 909 d.) Ἄνευ δὲ διακόνου ἐπίσκοπον ἀδύνατον εἶναι.

[21] Ep. ad Trall. n. 3. (Cotel. v. 2. p. 64.) Χωρὶς τούτων ἐκκλησία ἐκλέκτη οὐκ ἔστιν [al. οὐ καλεῖται] κ. τ. λ.

[22] De Martyr. Palæstin. c. 11. (v. 1. p. 409. 18.) Μνήμης δ' ἄξια τυγχάνει καὶ τὰ περὶ Ῥωμανὸν ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ἡμέρας ἀποτελεσθέντα· Παλαιστινὸς γὰρ οὗτος ὢν, διάκονός τε καὶ ἐξορκιστὴς τῆς ἐν Καισαρείᾳ παροικείας, κ. τ. λ.

[23] Not. in Euseb. de Martyr. Palæstin. c. 1. (v. 1. p. 407. n. 3. incip. p. 406.) Ibi ecclesiæ tria ministeria præbebat: unum in legendi officio, alterum in Syri interpretatione sermonis, et tertium adversus dæmones manus impositione consummans.

[24] Quæst. Vet. et Nov. Test. 101. See before, s. 4. p. 250. n. 55.

inferior services were still performed by the deacons. In the Greek Church they were always the *πυλωροὶ*, or *door-keepers*, in the time of the oblation and celebration of the eucharist, as may be seen in the Apostolical[25] Constitutions, where the deacons are commanded to stand at the men's gate, and the sub-deacons at the women's, to see that no one should go out or come in during the time of the oblation. These were anciently the deacons' principal employments in the assemblies of the Church.

12. Deacons the bishop's sub-almoners.

16. But besides these we are to take notice of two or three other offices, in which they were commonly employed by the bishop out of the Church. One of these was *to be his sub-almoners*, to take care of the necessitous, such as orphans, widows, virgins, martyrs in prison, and all the poor and sick who had any title to be maintained out of the public revenues of the Church. The deacons were particularly to inquire into the necessities and wants of all these, and make relation thereof to the bishop, and then distribute to them such charities as they received from him towards their relief and assistance. The archdeacon indeed was, as it were, the bishop's treasurer, but all the deacons were his dispensers, or ministers of the Church's charity to the indigent. Which appears from several passages in Cyprian[26], Dionysius of Alexandria[27], and the author of the Constitutions[28], who speak indifferently of

[25] L. 8. c. 11. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 398.) *Οἱ δὲ διάκονοι ἱστάσθωσαν εἰς τὰς τῶν ἀνδρῶν θύρας, καὶ οἱ ὑποδιάκονοι εἰς τὰς τῶν γυναικῶν, ὅπως μήτις ἐξέλθοι· μήτε ἀνοιχθῇ ἡ θύρα, κἂν πιστός τις ᾖ, κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἀναφορᾶς.*

[26] Ep. 49. [al. 52.] ad Cornel. (p. 237.) Nicostratum vero, diaconio sanctæ administrationis amisso, ecclesiasticis pecuniis sacrilega fraude subtractis, et viduarum ac pupillorum depositis denegatis, non tam in Africam venire voluisse, quam conscientia rapinarum ac criminum nefandorum illinc ab urbe fugisse.

[27] Ap. Euseb. l. 7. c. 11. (v. 1. p. 334. 20.) *Διάκονοι δὲ, οἱ μετὰ τοὺς ἐν τῇ νόσῳ τελευτήσαντας ὑπολειφθέντες, Φαῦστος, Εὐσέβιος, Χαιρήμων· Εὐσέβιος, ὃν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὁ Θεὸς ἐνεδυνάμωσε, καὶ παρεσκεύασε τὰς ὑπηρεσίας τῶν ἐν ταῖς φυλακαῖς γενομένων ὁμολογητῶν ἐναγωνίας ἀποπληροῦν, καὶ τὰς τῶν σωμάτων περιστολὰς τῶν τελείων καὶ μακαρίων μαρτύρων οὐκ ἀκινδύνως ἐκτελεῖν.*

[28] L. 2. c. 31. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 243.) *Μηδὲν δὲ ποιείτω τὸ σύνολον ἄνευ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, μηδέ τινι διδότω τι ἄνευ τῆς ἐκείνου γνώμης· ἐὰν γὰρ ὡς θλιβομένου τινος λάθρα τοῦ ἐπισκόπου διδῷ τινι, εἰς λοιδορίαν τοῦ ἐπισκόπου δώσει.*—It. c. 32. (ibid.) *Εἰ οὖν γινώσκεις, ὦ διάκονε, θλιβόμενόν τινα, ὑπομνήσας τὸν ἐπίσκοπον, οὕτω δίδου.*—It. l. 3. c. 19. (ibid. p. 290.) *Εἰ οὖν ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν καὶ ὁ διδάσκαλος οὕτως ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτὸν, πῶς ἂν ὑμεῖς ἐπαισχυνθήσεσθε τοῦτο ποιῆσαι τοῖς ἀδυνάτοις καὶ ἀσθενέσι τῶν ἀδελφῶν;.... Χρὴ οὖν ὑμᾶς τοὺς δια-*

this office as common to all the deacons. Particularly in the Constitutions the duty of the deacon is thus described: 'that he should inform his bishop when he knows any one to be in distress, and then distribute to their necessities by the directions of the bishop; but to do nothing clancularly without his consent, lest that might seem to accuse him of neglecting the distressed, and so turn to his reproach, and raise a murmuring against him.'

13. Deacons to inform the bishop of the misdemeanours of the people.

17. Another office of the deacons in this respect was to make inquiry into the morals and conversation of the people; and such evils as he could not redress himself by the ordinary power which was intrusted in his hands, of those he was to *give information to the bishop*, that he, by his supreme authority, might redress them. 'Let the deacon,' says the book of Constitutions[29], 'refer all things to the bishop, as Christ did to the Father: such things as he is able let him rectify by the power which he has from the bishop; but the weightier causes let the bishop judge.'

Hence deacons commonly called *the bishop's eyes, his mouth, angels, prophets*, &c.

18. Upon this account the deacons were usually styled *the bishop's eyes*, and *his ears, his mouth, his right hand*, and *his heart;* because by their ministry he overlooked his charge, and by them took cognizance of men's actions, as much as if he himself had seen them with his own eyes, or heard them with his own ears: by them he sent directions and orders to his flock, in which respect they were his mouth and his heart: by them he distributed to the necessities of the indigent, and so they were his right hand. These titles are frequently to be met with in the Constitutions[30] and the author of the Epistle[31] to St. James. And Isidore of Pelusium, in allusion to them, writing to Lucius[32] an archdeacon, tells him in the phrase

κόνους ἐπισκέπτεσθαι πάντας τοὺς δεομένους ἐπισκέψεως· καὶ περὶ τῶν θλιβομένων ἀναγγέλλετε τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ὑμῶν.

[29] L. 2. c. 44. (Cotel. ibid. p. 253.) Πάντα μὲν ὁ διάκονος τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ἀναφερέτω, ὡς Χριστὸς τῷ Πατρί· ἀλλ' ὅσα δὲ δύναται, εὐθυνέτω δι' ἑαυτοῦ λαβὼν παρὰ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τὴν ἐξουσίαν, ὡς ὁ Κύριος παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς τὸ δημιουργεῖν, [καὶ] τὸ προνοεῖν· τὰ δ' ὑπέρογκα ὁ ἐπίσκοπος κρινέτω.

[30] Ibid. (ibid.) Ἔστω ὁ διάκονος τοῦ ἐπισκόπου ἀκοὴ καὶ ὀφθαλμός καὶ στόμα· καρδία τε καὶ ψυχή.—L. 3. c. 19. (ibid. p. 290.).... Ψυχὴ γὰρ αὐτοῦ καὶ αἴσθησις εἶναι ὀφείλετε.

[31] Clem. Rom. Ep. ad Jacob. n. 12. (Cotel. ibid. p. 608.) Οἱ μὲν οὖν τῆς ἐκκλησίας διάκονοι τοῦ ἐπισκόπου συνετῶς ῥεμβόμενοι ἔστωσαν ὀφθαλμοὶ, κ. τ. λ.

[32] L. 1. Ep. 29. (p. 9 e.) Εἰ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἐπισκόπου τυγχάνουσιν οἱ τοῦ σεπτοῦ θυσιαστηρίου διάκονοι, σὺ δὲ

of the Church, 'that he ought to be all eye, forasmuch as deacons were the eyes of the bishop.' The author of the Constitutions[33] terms them likewise *the bishop's angels* and *prophets;* because they were the persons whom he chiefly employed in messages, either to his own people or foreign Churches. For then bishops did nothing but by the mouth or hands of one of their clergy.

Deacons to be multiplied according to the necessities of the Church.

19. For this reason, there being such a multitude and variety of business commonly attending the deacon's office, it was usual to have several deacons in the same Church. In some Churches they were very precise to the number *seven*, in imitation of the first Church of Jerusalem. The Council of Neocæsarea enacted it into a canon[34], 'that there ought to be but seven deacons in any city, though it was never so great, because this was according to the rule suggested in the Acts of the Apostles.' And the Church of Rome, both before and after this Council, seems to have looked upon that as a binding rule also: for it is evident from the Epistle of Cornelius[35], written in the middle of the third century, that there were then but seven deacons in the Church of Rome, though there were forty-six presbyters at the same time. And Prudentius intimates that it was so in the time of Sixtus also, anno 261; for speaking of Laurentius, the deacon, he terms him[36] 'the chief of those seven men who had their station near the altar,' meaning the seven deacons of the Church. Nay, in the fourth and fifth centuries the custom there continued the same, as we learn both from Sozomen[37] and Hilarius Sardus[38], the Roman

τούτων κατὰ συγχώρησιν Θεοῦ ἄρχεις, ὅλος ὀφθαλμὸς ὀφείλεις ὑπάρχειν.

[33] L. 2. c. 30. (Cotel. ibid. p. 243.) .....Ὥσπερ ὁ Υἱὸς ἄγγελός ἐστι καὶ προφήτης τοῦ Πατρὸς, οὕτω καὶ ὁ διάκονος ἄγγελος καὶ προφήτης ἐστὶ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου.

[34] C. 15. (t. 1. p. 1484 c.) Διάκονοι ἑπτὰ ὀφείλουσιν εἶναι κατὰ τὸν κανόνα, κἂν πάνυ μεγάλη εἴη ἡ πόλις· πεισθήσῃ δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς βίβλου τῶν Πράξεων.

[35] Ep. ad Fab. ap. Euseb. l. 6. c. 43. (v. 1. p. 312. 8.) Ὁ ἐκδικητὴς οὖν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου οὐκ ἠπίστατο ἕνα ἐπίσκοπον δεῖν εἶναι ἐν καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ· ἐν ᾗ οὐκ ἠγνόει, πῶς γάρ; πρεσβυτέρους εἶναι τεσσαράκοντα ἑξ, διακόνους ἑπτὰ, κ. τ. λ.

[36] Peristeph. Hymn. 2. de S. Laurent. Mart. vv. 37—40. (v. 1. p. 181.)

Hic primus e septem viris,
Qui stant ad aram proximi,
Levita sublimis gradu,
Et cæteris præstantior.

[37] L. 7. c. 19. (v. 2. p. 307. 10.) Διάκονοι παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις εἰσέτι νῦν οὐ πλείους εἰσὶν ἑπτά.

[38] In 1 Tim. 3, 13. p. 995. (Oper. Ambros. t. 2. append. p. 295 e.) Nunc autem septem diaconos esse oportet, aliquantos presbyteros, ut

deacon, who wrote under the name of St. Ambrose. But Sozomen says[39] this rule was not observed in other Churches, but the number of deacons was indifferent, as the business of every Church required. And it is certain it was so at Alexandria and Constantinople: for though one of the writers of the Life of St. Mark[40], cited by bishop Pearson, says St. Mark ordained but seven deacons at Alexandria, yet in after-ages there were more; for Alexander, in one of his Circular Letters[41], names nine deacons whom he deposed, with Arius, for their heretical opinions; and it is probable there were several others who continued orthodox; for in the form of Arius's condemnation, published by Cotelerius[42], the Catholic deacons of Alexandria and Mareotes are mentioned, as joining with their bishop in condemning him. And for the Church of Constantinople, the number of deacons was there so great, that in one of Justinian's Novels[43] we find them limited to an hundred for the service of the great church and three others only. So that it is evident the number of deacons usually increased with the necessities of the Church, and the Church of Rome was singular in the contrary practice.

Of the age at which deacons might be ordained.

20. I speak nothing here of the qualifications required in deacons, because they were generally the same that were required in bishops and presbyters, and will be spoken of hereafter; only in their age there was some difference, which is here to be observed. Bishops and presbyters, as has been noted above, might not ordinarily be ordained before thirty, but *deacons were allowed to be ordained at twenty-five*, and not before. This is the term fixed both by the Civil and Canon

bini sint per ecclesias, et unus in civitate episcopus.

[39] [Ibid. (p. 307. 13.).... Παρὰ δὲ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀδιάφορος ὁ τούτων ἀριθμός. *Grischov.*]

[40] Ap. Pearson. Vindic. Ignat. part. 2. c. 11. (Cotel. v. 2. p. 329.) B. Marcus Anizanum Alexandriæ ordinavit episcopum, et tres presbyteros .... et septem diaconos.

[41] Ep. Encycl. ap. Theodor. l. 1. c. 4. (v. 3. p. 21. 31.) Εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ ἀναθεματισθέντες αἱρεσιῶται· ἀπὸ πρεσβυτέρων μὲν Ἄρειος· ἀπὸ διακόνων δὲ, Ἀχιλλᾶς, Εὐξώϊος, Ἀειθαλῆς, Λούκιος, Σαρμάτης, Ἰούλιος, Μηνᾶς, Ἄρειος ἕτερος, καὶ Ἑλλάδιος.

[42] In Constit. Apost. l. 8. c. 28. (v. 1. p. 410. n. 92.) Ἀλέξανδρος πρεσβυτέροις καὶ διακόνοις Ἀλεξανδρείας καὶ Μαρεώτου παρὼν παροῦσιν ἀγαπητοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἐν Κυρίῳ χαίρειν. Εἰ καὶ φθάσαντες ὑπεγράψατε, οἷς ἐπέστειλα τοῖς περὶ Ἄρειον, κ. τ. λ.

[43] Novel. 3. c. 1. (t. 5. p. 33.) Quapropter sancimus non ultra sexaginta quidem presbyteros in sanctissima majore ecclesia esse, diaconos autem masculos centum et quadraginta fœminas, &c.

Law, as may be seen in Justinian's[44] Novels, the Councils of Agde[45], Carthage[46], Trullo[47], and many others[48]. And it was a rule very nicely observed: for though we meet with some bishops that were ordained before this age; yet those, as I have shewed before, were never deacons, but ordained immediately bishops from laymen; but among those that were ordained deacons, we scarce meet with an instance of any one that was ordained before the age of twenty-five in all the history of the Church.

Of the respect which deacons paid to presbyters, and received from the inferior orders.

21. The last thing which I shall observe of deacons, is *the great deference and respect they were obliged to pay to presbyters* as well as to the bishop. It has been proved before, that the presbyters had their thrones in the church, whereon they sat together with their bishop; but the deacons had no such privilege, but are always represented as standing by them. So the author of the Constitutions[49] and Gregory Nazianzen[50] place them in this order, viz. the bishop sitting on the middle throne, the presbyters sitting on each hand of him, and the deacons standing by. The Council of Nice expressly[51] forbids deacons to sit among the presbyters in the church. And it is evident from St. Jerom[52] and the author under the name of St. Austin[53], that though the Roman deacons were grown the most elated of any others, yet they did not presume *to sit* in the church. Nay, some canons go further and forbid[54]

[44] Novel. 123. c. 13. (t. 5. p. 546.) Presbyterum autem minorem triginta quinque annorum fieri non permittimus. Sed neque diaconum aut subdiaconum, minorem viginti quinque, &c.

[45] C. 16. (t. 4. p. 1386 a.) Episcopus benedictionem diaconatus minoribus quam viginti quinque annorum penitus non committat.

[46] Carth. 3. c. 4. (t. 2. p. 1167 e.) .. Placuit, ut ante viginti quinque annos ætatis nec diaconi ordinentur, nec virgines consecrentur.

[47] C. 14. (t. 6. p. 1150 a.) Ὁμοίως μήτε διάκονος πρὸ τῶν εἴκοσι πέντε ἐτῶν .... χειροτονείσθω.

[48] Tolet. 4. c. 20. (t. 5. p. 1712 d.) A viginti et quinque annis ætatis levitæ consecrentur.

[49] L. 2. c. 57. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 261.) .....Κείσθω δὲ μέσος τοῦ ἐπισκόπου θρόνος· παρ' ἑκάτερα δὲ αὐτοῦ καθεζέσθω τὸ πρεσβυτέριον, καὶ οἱ διάκονοι παραστάσθωσαν.

[50] Somn. de Eccles. Anastas. See before, c. 19. s. 5. p. 223. n. 18.

[51] C. 18. (t. 2. p. 37 d.) Ἀλλὰ μηδὲ καθῆσθαι ἐν μέσῳ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἐξέστω τοῖς διακόνοις.

[52] Ep. 85. [al. 146.] ad Evagr. [Evang.] (t. 1. p. 1077 b.) ... In ecclesia Romæ presbyteri sedent, et stant diaconi.

[53] Quæst. Vet. et Nov. Test. 101. (t. 3. append. p. 77.) Quanquam Romanæ ecclesiæ diaconi modice inverecundiores videantur, sedendi tamen dignitatem in ecclesia non præsumunt.

[54] C. Laod. c. 20. (t. 1. p. 1500 d.) Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ διάκονον ἔμπροσθεν πρεσ-

deacons to sit anywhere in the presence of a presbyter, except by his permission.

The like respect they were to pay to presbyters in several other instances, being obliged to minister to them, as well as to the bishop, in the performance of all divine offices: none of which might be performed by a deacon in the presence of a presbyter, without some special reason for it, as has been noted before. Nay, a deacon was not allowed so much as to bless a common feast, if a presbyter was present at it: as we may see in St. Jerom's Epistle to Evagrius[55], where he censures the Roman deacons somewhat sharply for presuming to do so.

But then, as the canons obliged deacons to pay this respect to presbyters, so to distinguish them from the lesser clergy, all *the inferior orders were required to pay the same respect to them.* The Council of Laodicea in the same canon that says, 'a deacon shall not sit in the presence of a presbyter without his leave,' adds immediately after, 'that in like manner the deacon shall be honoured by the subdeacons and all the other clergy.' And the Council of Agde repeats the canon[56] in the same words. I shall here also remind the reader of what I have observed before, that deacons in some Churches had power to censure the inferior clergy in the absence of the presbyters. St. Jerom[57] seems also to say, that their revenues were rather greater than those of the presbyters, which made them sometimes troublesome and assuming. Besides all this the order of deacons was of great repute, because the archdeacon was always then one of this order, and he was commonly a man of great interest and authority in the Church; of whose powers and privileges, because it is ne-

βυτέρου καθέζεσθαι, ἀλλὰ μετὰ κελεύσεως τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου καθέζεσθαι.—[Conf. C. Carth. 4. c. 39. (t. 2. p. 1197 a.) Ut diaconus [quolibet loco,] jubente presbytero, sedeat.

[55] Ep. 85. ut supr. n. 52. (t. 1. p. 1077 b.) Licet, increbrescentibus vitiis, inter presbyteros, absente episcopo, sedere diaconum viderim: et in domesticis conviviis benedictiones presbyteris dare. [al. benedictiones coram presbyteris dare.]

[56] C. 65. (t. 4. p. 1394 a.) Non oportet diaconum sedere, præsente presbytero, sed ex jussione presbyteri sedeat. Similiter autem honorificetur diaconus a ministris inferioribus et [omnibus] clericis.

[57] Ep. 85. ut supr. n. 52. (t. 1. p. 1077 d.) Presbyter noverit se lucris minorem, sacerdotio esse majorem.—Conf. in Ezek. 48. (t. 5. p. 607 b.).... Ultra sacerdotes, hoc est, presbyteros intumescunt: et dignitatem non merito sed divitiis æstimant.

cessary to discourse a little more particularly, I shall treat distinctly of them in the following chapter.

CHAP. XXI.

Of archdeacons.

Archdeacons anciently of the same order with deacons.

1. THOUGH archdeacons, in these last ages of the Church, have usually been of the order of presbyters, yet anciently they were *no more than deacons:* which appears evidently from those writers, who give us the first account of them. St. Jerom[58] says, 'the archdeacon was chosen out of the deacons, and was the principal deacon in every Church, as the archpresbyter was the principal presbyter;' and 'that there was but one of each in every Church.' Optatus[59] calls Cæcilian 'archdeacon of Carthage;' yet he was never more than a deacon, till he was ordained bishop, as has been shewed before: and that made Cæcilian himself say[60], 'that if he was not rightly ordained bishop, as the Donatists pretended, he was to be treated only as a deacon.' It is certain also St. Laurence, archdeacon of Rome, was no more than the chief of the deacons, or the principal man of the seven, who stood and waited at the altar, as Prudentius[61] words it. From these testimonies it is very plain, that in those times the archdeacon was always one of the order of deacons.

Elected by the bishop, and not made by seniority.

2. But how the archdeacon came by his honour, and after what manner he was invested with his office, is a matter of some dispute among learned men. Salmasius[62] and some

[58] Ibid. (p. 1076 c.) Aut diaconi eligant de se, quem industrium noverint, et archidiaconum vocent.—Ep. 4. [al. 125.] ad Rustic. (ibid. p. 936 c.) Singuli ecclesiarum episcopi, singuli archipresbyteri, singuli archidiaconi.

[59] Lib. 1. p. 40. (p. 18.) Cum correptionem archidiaconi Cæciliani ferre non posset, etc.

[60] Ibid. p. 41. (p. 20.) Iterum a Cæciliano mandatum est, ut si Felix in se, sicut illi arbitrabantur, nihil contulisset, ipsi tanquam adhuc diaconum ordinarent Cæcilianum.

[61] Peristeph. Hymn. 2. See ch. 20. s. 19. p. 269. n. 36.

[62] De Primat. c. 1. (p. 8.) Cum igitur primum diaconum aut primum presbyterum legimus in antiquorum scriptis, de eo intelligendum, qui ordinationis tempore prior est..... Ita et ex primo episcopo archiepiscopus exiit electione, qui olim primatum habuisset ætatis ac *προγενεσίας* merito. Sic etiam facti archidiaconi.—Conf. Suicer. Thes. Eccles. in voce *ἀρχιδιάκονος*. (t. 1. p. 532.) [After referring to the authorities of Salmasius and Meursius he adds,—Archidiaconus diversus a primo diacono. Officium quippe est ecclesiasticum quod junioribus etiam diaconis plerumque defertur. In illis autem officiis ecclesiasticis *δίκαιον προγενεσίας* locum non habuit.

others are of opinion, that originally he was no more than the senior deacon, though they own that in process of time the office became *elective*. Habertus[63] thinks it was always elective, and that it was at the bishop's liberty and discretion to nominate which of the deacons he thought fit to the office. That it was so in the case of Athanasius, seems pretty evident from what Theodoret[64] says of him, 'that though he was very young, yet he was made chief of the order of deacons; for this implies, as Valesius there observes, 'that he was chosen by the bishop, and preferred before his seniors.' St. Jerom, in the forecited passage, as plainly asserts that the office went not by seniority, but election; only he seems to put the power of electing in the deacons. But if they had any hand in it, it must be understood to be under the direction of the bishop, who is required by some canons to choose his own archdeacon, and ordinarily to give preference to the senior, if he was duly qualified; but if not, to make choice of any other, whom he thought most fit to discharge the offices of the Church[65], and the trust that was reposed in him.

Commonly persons of such interest in the Church, that they were chosen the bishops' successors.

3. The office of the archdeacon was always *a place of great honour and reputation:* for he was the bishop's constant attendant and assistant; and next to the bishop the eyes of the whole Church were fixed upon him. By which means he commonly gained such an interest, as to get himself chosen the bishop's successor before the presbyters; of which it were easy to give several instances, as Athanasius, Cæcilian, and many others. And this I presume was the reason why St. Jerom says[66], 'that an archdeacon thought himself injured, if he was

Ita olim primus presbyter, ætate nimirum et ordinatione prior, præsidis vicem in collegio presbyterorum tenebat. Postea electus est, qui has partes impleret, et episcopus is proprie dictus..... Fuit autem archidiaconus officium potius, quam gradus in ordine. Is potior dignitate post episcopum, &c. Ed.]

[63] Archierat. observ. 6. (p. 206.) Sole clarius efficimus archidiaconum electione, non vero tempore, dignitate non antiquitate, diaconis prolatum et præfectum.

[64] L. 1. c. 26. (v. 3. p. 59. 8.) Ἀνὴρ παιδόθεν μὲν τοῖς θείοις μαθήμασιν ἐντραφείς· ἐν ἑκάστῃ δὲ τάξει τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν χορῶν γενόμενος ἀξιάγαστος'.. συνῆν δὲ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τῷ πάνυ, νεὸς μὲν ὢν τὴν ἡλικίαν, τοῦ χοροῦ δὲ τῶν διακόνων ἡγούμενος.

[65] Vid. C. Agathens. c. 23. (t. 4. p. 1387 b.) Si officium archidiaconatus, propter simpliciorem naturam implere aut expedire nequiverit, ille loci sui nomen teneat, et ordinationi ecclesiæ, quem elegerit episcopus, præponatur.

[66] In Ezek. 48. (t. 5. p. 607 b.) Certe qui primus fuerit ministrorum,

ordained a presbyter;' probably, because he thereby lost his interest in the Church, and was disappointed of his preferment. We might certainly conclude it was thus in the Church of Rome, if what Eulogius, a Greek writer in Photius[67], says might be depended on as true: 'that it was a law at Rome to choose the archdeacon the bishop's successor; and that therefore Cornelius ordained Novatian presbyter, to deprive him of the privilege and hopes of succeeding.' But I confess there is no small reason to question the truth of this relation, both because we read of no such law in any writer of the Latin Church; and because this author palpably mistakes in saying that Cornelius ordained Novatian presbyter, who was presbyter long before; and probably never was archdeacon nor deacon, but ordained presbyter immediately from a layman; as may be collected from the letters of Cyprian[68] and Cornelius[69] which tacitly reflect upon him for it. Yet, if by law Eulogius meant no more than custom, perhaps it might be customary at Rome, as at some other places, to make the archdeacons the bishops' successors; their power and privileges, as I observed, commonly gaining them a considerable interest both among the clergy and the people.

The o of the deacon 1. To tend t bishop the al &c.

4. As to the archdeacon's *office*, he was always the bishop's immediate minister and attendant. *A latere pontificis non recessit*, to use St. Jerom's phrase, *he was always by his side, ready to assist him.* Particularly at the altar, when the bishop ministered, he performed the usual offices of a deacon, that have been mentioned in the last chapter. The author of the Constitutions calls him, ὁ παρεστὼς τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ, *the deacon that stood by the bishop* and proclaimed, when the communion service began[70], 'Let no one approach in wrath against his

quia per singula concionatur in populos, et a pontificis latere non recedit, injuriam putat, si presbyter ordinetur.

[67] Biblioth. cod. 182. (p. 412. 47.) Τὸν ἀρχιδιάκονον ἐνενόμιστο διάδοχον τοῦ ἀρχιερατεύοντος καθίστασθαι.

[68] Ep. 52. [al. 55.] ad Antonian. p. 103. (p. 243.) Non iste [Cornelius] ad episcopatum subito pervenit, sed per omnia ecclesiastica officia promotus, et in divinis administrationibus Dominum sæpe promeritus, ad sacerdotii sublime fastigium cunctis religionis gradibus adscendit.

[69] Ep. ad Fab. ap. Euseb. l. 6. c. 43. (v. 1. p. 314. 12.) Καταλιπὼν γὰρ ὁ λαμπρὸς οὗτος τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐν ᾗ πιστεύσας κατηξιώθη τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου κατὰ χάριν τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τοῦ ἐπιθέντος αὐτῷ χεῖρας εἰς πρεσβυτερίου κλῆρον, κ. τ. λ.

[70] L. 2. c. 57. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 264.) .... Μήτις κατά τινος· μήτις ἐν ὑποκρίσει.

brother! let no one come in hypocrisy!' To him it belonged to minister the cup to the people, when the bishop celebrated the eucharist and had administered the bread before him; as we learn from the account which St. Ambrose[71] gives of Laurentius, archdeacon of Rome. It was his business also, as the bishop's substitute, to order all things relating to the inferior clergy, and their ministrations and services in the church: as what deacon should read the Gospel, who should bid the prayers, which of them should keep the doors, which walk about the church to observe the behaviour of the people; which of the readers, acolythists, subdeacons, should perform their service at such a time, or in what post and station. For these things were not precisely determined, but at the bishop's liberty to ordain and appoint them; which he commonly did by his archdeacon, whose orders and directions therefore are sometimes called *ordinationes*, and *ordinatio ecclesiæ*, in some of the ancient Councils[72]; whence I presume came the name *ordinary*, which is a title given to archdeacons in after-ages.

2. To assist him in managing the Church's revenues.

5. He assisted the bishop in *managing and dispensing the Church's revenues*, having the chief care of the poor, orphans, widows, &c., under the bishop, whose portions were assigned by him, and sent by the hands of the other deacons that were under him. The fourth Council of Carthage[73] makes mention of this part of his office, when it requires the bishop 'not to concern himself personally in the care and government of the widows, orphans, and strangers, but to commit this to his archpresbyter or archdeacon.' Upon this account Prudentius[74], describing the offices of St. Laurence, whom he makes to be archdeacon of Rome, among other things assigns him the keys of the Church's treasure, and the care of dispensing the obla-

[71] De Offic. l. 1. c. 41. See ch. 20. s. 8. p. 256. n. 82.

[72] Vid. C. Agathens. c. 23. See n. 65, preceding.—Conf. Isidor. Hispal. Ep. ad Ludifred. ap. Gratian. dist. 25. c. 1. n. 11. (t. 1. p. 121. 27.—Oper. Isidor. p. 413 f.) .. Ordinatio vestiendi altaris, &c. Solicitudo quoque parochiarum, et ordinatio, et jurgia, ad ejus pertinent curam.

[73] C. 17. (t. 2. p. 1201 c.) Ut episcopus gubernationem viduarum, pupillorum, ac peregrinorum, non per seipsum, sed per archipresbyterum, aut per archidiaconum, agat.

[74] Peristeph. Hymn. 11. ut supra, vv. 39—44. (v. 1. p. 181.)

Levita sublimis gradu,
Et cæteris præstantior,
Claustris sacrorum præerat,
Cœlestis arcanum domus
Fidis gubernans clavibus,
Votasque dispensans opes.

tions of the people. And for the same reason both he and St. Ambrose[75], and all other writers of his Passion, bring in the heathen persecutor demanding of him those treasures, which he had in his keeping; which he promising to do, in a short time after, brought before him the poor, the lame, the blind, the infirm; telling him, 'those were the riches which he had in his custody, for on them he had expended the Church's treasure.' St. Austin[76] says this was his office, as he was archdeacon of the Church. Paulinus[77] therefore calls the archdeacon, *arcæ custodem, the keeper of the chest;* because, though the other deacons were the dispensers and conveyers, yet he was the chief manager and director of them, and from him they took their orders, as from the guardian of the Church's treasure. It was upon this account that the Donatists charged Cæcilian, among other things[78], 'that he had prohibited the deacons from carrying any provision to the martyrs in prison.' Which objection must be grounded upon this, that he was obliged by his office, as he was archdeacon, to see that the martyrs were provided of sustenance; which they pretended he had not only neglected, but abused his authority, in forbidding those that were under his command to minister unto them.

6. Another part of his office was to *assist the bishop in preaching.* For as any deacon was authorized to preach by the bishop's leave, so the archdeacon, being the most eminent of the deacons, was more frequently pitched upon to discharge 3. In preaching.

[75] De Offic. l. 2. c. 28. (t. 2. p. 103 f. n. 140.) Tale aurum sanctus martyr Laurentius Domino reservavit, a quo cum quærerentur thesauri ecclesiæ, promisit se demonstraturum. Sequenti die pauperes duxit. Interrogatus ubi essent thesauri quos promiserat, ostendit pauperes dicens, Hi sunt thesauri ecclesiæ.

[76] Serm. 111. de Diversis, [al. 302.] (t. 5. p. 1229 a.) Sanctus Laurentius archidiaconus fuit: opes ecclesiæ ab illo persecutore quærebantur.—Serm. 123. de Diversis, [al. 303.] (ibid. p. 1233 d.) .... Et tamquam ab archidiacono postulatæ essent res ecclesiæ, &c.

[77] De Miracul. [s. de Vit.] S. Martin. l. 4. ap. Bibl. Patr. Par. 1654. t. 8. p. 865. (ap. Bibl. Max. Lugdun. 1677. t. 6. p. 309 b. 6.)

Protinus adstanti diacono, quem more priorum
Antistes sanctæ custodem legerat arcæ,
Imperat, &c.

[78] Vid. August. Brevic. Collat. die 3. c. 14. (t. 9. p. 569 a.) .... Et recitatum est a Donatistis concilium ferme septuaginta episcoporum contra Cæcilianum apud Carthaginem factum; ubi eum absentem damnaverunt, quod ad eos venire noluerit, tamquam a traditoribus ordinatus, et quia cum esset diaconus, victum afferri martyribus in custodia constitutis prohibuisse dicebatur.

this office; if we may so understand those words of St. Jerom, which have been cited before in the third section, *Primus ministrorum per singula concionatur in populos, The chief minister or archdeacon is many times and in many places employed in preaching to the people.* For the word *singula* may relate both to times and places. But if any one thinks that *concionari* here signifies no more than *prædicare* and *κηρύσσειν, doing the office of an holy crier in the assembly,* I shall not contend about it; but only say that St. Jerom, speaking of something that then made the archdeacons popular, seems rather to mean the office of *preaching* than any other.

4. In ordaining the inferior clergy.

7. The archdeacon usually bore a part with the bishop *in the ordinations of the inferior clergy,* subdeacons, acolythists, &c. His office in this matter is particularly described in several canons of the fourth Council of Carthage[79], which relate the manner how the inferior clergy were to be ordained, viz. not by imposition of hands, which belonged only to the superior orders, but by receiving some vessels or utensils of the church, partly from the hands of the bishop, and partly from the hands of the archdeacon. As, to give only one instance, in the ordination of an acolythist the canon says, 'the bishop was to inform him what his duty was; and then the archdeacon was to give him a taper into his hand, that he might know that he was appointed to light the candles of the church.'

5. The archdeacon had power to censure deacons and the inferior

8. The archdeacon was invested also with *a power of censuring* the other deacons and all the inferior clergy of the Church. That it was so, at least in some Churches, is very evident from a passage in the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon, where Ibas, bishop of Edessa, speaking of Maras, one of the

[79] C. 5. (t. 2. p. 1200 a.) Subdiaconus cum ordinatur, quia manus impositionem non accipit, patenam de episcopi manu accipiat vacuam et calicem vacuum. De manu vero archidiaconi urceolum cum aqua et mantile et manutergium.—C. 6. (ibid. b.) Acolythus cum ordinatur, ab episcopo quidem doceatur, qualiter in officio suo agere debeat. Sed ab archidiacono accipiat ceroferarium cum cereo, ut sciat se ad accendenda ecclesiæ luminaria mancipari. Accipit et urceolum vacuum, ad suggerendum vinum in eucharistiam sanguinis Christi.—C. 9. (ibid. d.) Ostiarius cum ordinatur, postquam ab archidiacono instructus fuerit, qualiter in domo Dei debeat conversari, ad suggestionem archidiaconi tradit ei episcopus claves ecclesiæ de altario, dicens, Sic age quasi redditurus Deo rationem pro his rebus, quæ his clavibus recluduntur.

deacons of his Church, says[80] 'he was not excommunicated by himself, but by his archdeacon, who, for a crime committed against a presbyter, suspended him from the communion.' clergy, t not pres byters.

But whether the archdeacon had any power over presbyters[81], is a matter of dispute among learned men. Salmasius[82], and the learned Suicerus[83] after him, scruple not to assert, 'that even the archpresbyter himself in the Roman Church was subject to him.' Cujacius and some others, who are cited by Baluzius[84], go one step further, and say it was so in all Churches. Yet there is not the least footstep of any such power to be met with in any ancient writer or Council; but the original of all the mistake is owing to a corruption in Gratian's Decree, and Gregory the Ninth's Decretals, who cite the words alleged[85] in the margin; the one as from Isidore of Sevil, and the other from the Council of Toledo, pretending that the archpresbyter is to be subject to the archdeacon: when yet, as both Baluzius and the Roman correctors confess, there are no such words to be found in Isidore's Epistle; nor will Garsias Loaisa[86] own them to be the genuine decree of any Council of Toledo. So that the whole credit of this matter rests upon Gratian and the compilers of the Decretals, whose

[80] Act. 10. (t. 4. p. 653 d.) Ὁ θεοσεβέστατος ἐπίσκοπος Ἴβας εἶπε ... Μάρας κατὰ τὸ ἀληθὲς ἀκοινώνητός ἐστι τῷ ἰδίῳ.

[81] [Conf. C. Cabillon. 2. c. 15. (t. 7. p. 1275 d.) Dictum est quod in plerisque locis archidiaconi super presbyteros parochianos quamdam exerceant dominationem et ab eis census exigant, quod magis ad tyrannidem, quam ad rectitudinis ordinem pertinet ... Sed contenti sint regularibus disciplinis et teneant propriam mensuram et quod eis ab episcopis injungitur: hoc per parochias suas exercere studeant, nihil per cupiditatem et avaritiam præsumentes. Ed.]

[82] De Primat. c. 1. (p. 9. im.) In Romana ecclesia vicarius fuit episcopi, et archipresbyterum etiam sub se habebat: quod mirum, cum presbyteros diaconis majores fuisse notum sit.

[83] Thes. Eccles. See the second part of n. 62, preceding. [Suicer cites the preceding passage from Salmasius. Ed.]

[84] Not. ad Gratian. dist. 25. c. 1. p. 455. (ap. Oper. Ant. August. t. 3. p. 173. col. sinistr.) Ceterum Cujacius agens de hoc ipso negotio, &c.

[85] Dist. 25. c. 1. ex Ep. Isidor. Hispal. ad Ludifred. (t. 1. p. 121. 63.—Oper. Isidor. p. 413 g.) Archipresbyter vero se esse sub archidiacono, ejusque præceptis, sicut episcopi sui, sciat obedire.—In Gregory's Decretal, l. 1. tit. 24., (Corp. Jur. Canon. t. 2. p. 318. 50.) de Officio Archipresb. c. 1., the same words are cited ex C. Toletano.

[86] [Vid. sub C. Tolet. 1. (t. 2. p. 1231 e.) Fragmenta sub titulo Conciliorum Toletanorum vel corrupte vel falso citata; cum in his Conciliis non inveniantur per eundem Garsiam Loaisam collecta.—Ex C. Tolet. (ibid. p. 1233 a.) Ut archipresbyter sciat se subesse archidiacono et ejus præceptis, sicut sui episcopi, obedire, &c. Ed.]

authority is of little esteem in things relating to antiquity, when there is no better proof than their bare assertion. Yet I shall not deny, but that in Gratian's time it might be as he represents it; for probably by this time the archdeacons were chosen out of the order of presbyters; though when first they began to be so is not very easy to determine. Only we are certain that some centuries before the time of Gratian the custom was altered. For archdeacons, in the ninth century, were some of them at least of the order of presbyters; as appears from Hincmar's Capitula[87], directed to Guntharius and Odelhardus, two of his archdeacons, whom he styles *presbyter-archdeacons*. And there is reason enough to think it was so in the time of Gratian. The archdeacons were then generally of the order of presbyters, as they have been ever since: which makes it no wonder that in Gratian's time they should have power over the *archipresbyteri*, which, in the language of that age, often signifies no more than *rural deans*, over which the archdeacons have usually power at this day.

But by this the reader may judge how little such writers are to be depended on, who take their estimate of former ages from the practice of their own, and reckon every thing ancient that is agreeable to the rules and customs of the times they live in.

f the me ἀναγνώστης, *circumlustrator*, and ıether chdeacons had y power er the ıole diose.

9. But to return to the archdeacons of the primitive Church. There is one thing more may admit of some dispute,—whether the archdeacon's power anciently extended over the whole diocese, or was confined to the city or mother-church? In the middle ages of the Church there is no question but they had power over the whole diocese; for Isidorus Hispalensis, who lived in the beginning of the seventh century, in the account which he gives of the archdeacon's office, says[88], 'the parochial clergy were under his care,' that is, the deacons and inferior clergy; 'and that it belonged to him to order matters and end controversies among them; to give the bishop an account what

[87] Capitula Archidiaconibus Presbyteris data, ap. Labb. CC. t. 8. p. 591 b. (Oper. Hincmar. t. 1. p. 738.) See the Inscription.

[88] Ep. ad Ludifred. ap. Gratian. dist. 25. c. 1. (Oper. Isidor. p. 413 f.) Solicitudo quoque parochitanorum [al. parochiarum] et ordinatio, et jurgia ad ejus pertinent curam: pro reparandis diœcesanis basilicis ipse suggerit sacerdoti: ipse inquirit parochias cum jussione episcopi, et ornamenta, vel res basilicarum parochitanorum [al. parochiarum] et libertatum ecclesiasticarum episcopo idem refert.

churches stood in need of repairing; to make inquiry by the bishop's order into the state of every parish, and see what condition the ornaments and goods of the church were in, and whether the ecclesiastical liberties were maintained.' Habertus[89] thinks the archdeacons were invested with the same power some ages before, and for proof cites a passage out of the Council of Chalcedon, where, in an instrument[90] presented by the presbyters of Edessa against Ibas, their bishop, one Abramius, a deacon of that Church, in all the Latin translations is called *diaconus apantita*, which Habertus takes to be *a general inspector* of the church. But there are two evident reasons against this, which it is a wonder so observing a person as Habertus should not see: 1st. That Abramius was not an archdeacon, but only a private deacon of the Church. For in the same place there is mention made of another archdeacon, who, when Ibas was about to have had Abramius ordained bishop of Batena, interposed and hindered him from doing it, because he had been censured for the practice of magic, and never given any satisfaction to the Church. And though it is said that Ibas took occasion to remove that archdeacon from his office, yet it is not once intimated that he put Abramius in his room; which if he had done, it would doubtless have been made another article of accusation against him before the Council. 2dly. The original Greek in Labbe's edition is not διάκονος ἀπαντιτὴς, as Habertus reads it, but only διάκονος ἀπ' αὐτῆς τῆς ἡμετέρης ἐκκλησίας, *a deacon of that our Church* of Edessa: and though ἀπαντιτὴς be put into the margin, yet it is not owned to be any various reading, but only the editor's conjecture; which I think is not sufficient to build such an assertion upon, when no other proof or authority is pretended. Therefore I determine nothing concerning this power of the archdeacons in ancient times, but leave it to further inquiry and the determination of every judicious reader.

10. Valesius takes notice of another name which he thinks Of the name *cor-*

[89] Archierat. part. 9. observ. 6. n. 5. (p. 209.) *Sollicitudo et ordinatio paræciarum* ad archidiaconum spectat, ait Isidorus, quod maxime in diaconum apantitam cadit, de quo in Actis Concilii Chalcedonensis in libello Samuelis et aliorum presbyterorum Edessæ, Ἀβραάμιος διάκονος ἀπαντιτὴς τῆς ἡμετέρας ἐκκλησίας.

[90] Act. 10. n. 16. (t. 4. p. 650 d.) Hic apantita erat nostræ ecclesiæ, &c.

episcopi, why given to archdeacons.

was sometimes given to the archdeacons, that is the name *cor-episcopi;* for which he cites the words of one Joannes Abbas[91] in a book written about the translation of the relics of St. Glodesindis. This at first may look like a corruption of the name *chorepiscopus,* because in the latter ages the power of the ancient *chorepiscopi* dwindled into that of the archdeacons. But when it is considered that all the deacons anciently were called the bishop's eyes, and his ears, his mouth, and his heart, as has been noted in the last chapter, sect. 18, it will appear very probable that the archdeacon should be peculiarly dignified with those titles; and therefore be called *cor-episcopi, the bishop's heart,* because he was used to signify his mind and will to the people: as he is called *oculus episcopi,* not only in ancient authors[92], but in the Decretals[93], and the Council of Trent[94], because he was *the bishop's eye* to inspect the diocese under him.

The opinions of learned men concerning the first original of the name and office of archdeacon.

11. Some may perhaps be desirous to know further *the first rise and original of the name and office of archdeacons* in the Church; but this is a matter involved in so great obscurity, that it cannot easily be determined. Habertus and some others[95] of the Roman Communion reckon this office as ancient as that of deacons themselves, deriving both from apo-

[91] Not. in Theodor. l. 1. c. 26. (v. 3. p. 59. n. 2.).... Ad hoc inspiciendum sacrorum ministros cum archidiacono majore, quem cor-episcopi dicunt, [pontifex] direxit.

[92] Isidor. Pelus. l. 1. Ep. 26. See before, ch. 20. s. 18. p. 268. n. 32.

[93] L. 1. tit. 23. c. 7. (Corp. Jur. Canon. t. 2. p. 315. 30.) Item in Epistola B. Clementis papæ, prædecess. nostri, oculus episcopi archidiaconus appellatur, ut loco episcopi per episcopatum prospiciens, quæ corrigenda viderit, corrigat et emendet; nisi adeo fuerint ardua negotia, quod absque majoris sui præsentia nequeant terminari.

[94] Sess. 24. c. 12. de Reformat. (t. 14. p. 886 d.) Archidiaconi etiam, qui oculi dicuntur episcopi.

[95] Habert. Archierat. part 9. observ. 6. n. 2. (p. 207.) Quæsivit a me aliquis, quam antiqua esset archidiaconi nomenclatura: nam de re constat tam antiquam esse quam est ipsa diaconorum institutio: unde S. Stephanum archidiaconum vocat Menelogium. Nomen vero archidiaconi apud antiquius concilium Nicæno reperire non esset, si vera esset illa farrago Canonum Arabicorum editionis Alphonsi Pisan. et Turriani PP. Soc. Jes.; in cujus canonibus frequentissima fit mentio archidiaconi, &c... Antiquioris ergo non est mihi notæ auctor, apud quem archidiaconi nomen legerim, sancto Hieronymo, &c.—Baron. an. 34. n. 285. (p. 1. p. 237 e.) Quod Lucas recensendo singulorum septem diaconorum nomina, primum ordine ponat Stephanum; S. Augustinus ex eo accidisse putavit, quod primatum ageret inter diaconos: unde hæc ait, *Inter diaconos nominatus primus, sicut inter Apostolos Petrus.* Idemque primicerius diaconorum et archidiaconus, ut a Luciano et aliis nonnullis, tam Græcis quam Latinis, appellatus habetur.

stolical constitution, and making Stephen the first archdeacon of the Church. But others[96] with greater reason deduce it only from the third century, and leave it as a matter under debate and inquiry, whether there were any such thing as the archdeacon's office in the time of Cornelius, bishop of Rome, which was in the middle of the third century. This is certain, that Cornelius in his Epistle to Fabius[97], where he gives a catalogue of the Roman clergy, though he speaks of deacons, subdeacons, acolythists, exorcists, readers, and door-keepers, makes no particular mention of the archdeacon; nor does Cyprian ever so much as once use the name. Yet before the end of this century Cæcilian is supposed to have had the title, as well as the office, of archdeacon of Carthage, because Optatus calls him so; and the name often occurs in St. Jerom and other writers of the fourth age, in which St. Jerom lived. Baronius indeed urges St. Austin's authority to prove that Stephen was properly an archdeacon; for he says, St. Austin calls him *primicerius diaconorum*. But he that will look into St. Austin will quickly find his mistake; for his words are not *primicerius diaconorum*, but *primicerius martyrum*[98], *the protomartyr*, as we commonly call him, because he was the first that suffered for the name of Christ. And hence the reader may observe by the way, that the words *primicerius* and *primus* do not always denote principality or priority of power and jurisdiction, but only priority of time, or precedency of honour and dignity, in respect of place or outward order. In which sense the same St. Austin says, in another place[99], 'that Stephen is named first among the deacons, as Peter was

[96] Fell, in Cypr. Ep. 52. [al. 49.] ad Cornel. (p. 237. n. 4.) Priorius ait, *Non uno crimine hæreseos laborasse videtur hic Nicostratus, qui mihi archidiaconus fuisse videtur, cui enim creditæ erant opes et pecuniæ ecclesiæ; verum metu judicii, ob rapinam et sacrilegium, in Africam Novatum secutus est.* Dispiciendum, utrum Nicostrati sæculo obtinuerit archidiaconatus munus.

[97] Ap. Euseb. l. 6. c. 43. (v. 1. p. 312. 10.) ..... Οὐκ ἠγνόει ..... πρεσβυτέρους εἶναι τεσσαράκοντα ἑξ, διακόνους ἑπτὰ, ὑποδιακόνους ἑπτὰ, ἀκολούθους δύο καὶ τεσσαράκοντα, ἐξορκιστὰς δὲ καὶ ἀναγνώστας ἅμα πυλωροῖς δύο καὶ πεντήκοντα, χήρας σὺν θλιβομένοις [al. συνθλιβομένας] ὑπὲρ τὰς χιλίας πεντακοσίας, οὓς πάντας ἡ τοῦ Δεσπότου χάρις καὶ φιλανθρωπία διατρέφει.

[98] Serm. 1. de Sanctis, t. 10. [al. 215.] (t. 5. append. p. 357 b.) Hodie celebramus natalem, quo primicerius martyrum migravit ex mundo.

[99] Serm. 94. de Diversis, [al. 316.] (ibid. p. 1268 b.) Inter diaconos illos nominatur primus, sicut inter Apostolos Petrus.

among the Apostles;' which is a primacy that may be allowed to them both, without any pretence of jurisdiction. Habertus urges further the authority of the Greek Menologion, which gives Stephen the title of archdeacon. But such books are not sufficient evidence, being they are of a modern date, and speak of ancient things in the language and phrase of their own times: for which reason they are not much to be depended on, except when they are backed with the concurrent testimony of some ancient authors, of which there are none in this case to yield any collateral evidence to this assertion. Yet, on the other hand, the opinion of Salmasius is equally to be discarded, who[1] asserts that the office of archdeacon was not in the Church in the time of St. Jerom; though St. Jerom[2] himself says, in most express words, 'that the custom then was to have one bishop, one archpresbyter, one archdeacon, in every Church.' But this is the usual way of that author in his book *De Primatu*, to advance paradoxes of his own fancy for ancient history, and lay down positive assertions upon the most slender conjectures; yea, many times against the plainest evidence of primitive records; as in the case before us, and many others, which I have had occasion to take notice of in this discourse. It were to be wished that that author, who wrote upon a useful design, had been a little more accurate in his accounts of the state of the clergy of the primitive Church; and, whilst he was demolishing the Pope's supremacy, had not confusedly treated of some other orders and offices, which were of greater antiquity in the Church.

CHAP. XXII.

Of deaconesses.

ncient 1. Having spoken of deacons and archdeacons, it remains

[1] De Primat. c. 1. (p. 8.) Hieronymus in Epistola ad Evagrium: [Evangelum:] *Nam et Alexandriæ a Marco evangelista usque ad Heraclam et Dionysium episcopos, presbyteri semper unum ex se electum, in excelsiori gradu collocatum, episcopum nominabant: quomodo si exercitus imperatorem faciat; aut diaconi eligant de se, quem industrium noverint, et archidiaconum vocent.* Apparet nondum tunc archidiaconi officium ac dignitatem in ecclesia fuisse. Presbyteri, inquit, e suo numero eligebant quem in excelsiori gradu locabant et episcopum nominabant. Quod eodem modo fit, ac si diaconi de se eligerent, quem industrium nossent, et archidiaconum vocarent, &c.

[2] Ep. 4. ad Rustic. See s. 1. p. 273. n. 58. last part.

that I say something in this place of *deaconesses*, because their office and service was of great use in the primitive Church. There is some mention made of them in Scripture, by which it appears that their office was as ancient as the apostolical age. St. Paul calls Phœbe "a servant of the Church of Cenchrea." Rom. 16, 1. The original word is διάκονος, *a deaconess*, answerable to the Latin word *ministra*, which is the name that is given them in Pliny's Epistle[3], which speaks about the Christians. Tertullian[4] and some others call them *viduæ*, *widows*, and their office *viduatus*, because they were commonly chosen out of the *widows* of the Church. For the same reason Epiphanius[5] and the Council of Laodicea[6] call them πρεσβύτιδες, *elderly widows*, because none but such were ordinarily taken into this office.

names *deaconesses*, διάκονοι, πρεσβύτιδες, *viduæ*, *ministræ*.

2. For indeed by some ancient laws these *four qualifications* were required in every one that was to be taken into this order: first, that she should be a widow; secondly, that she should be a widow that had borne children; thirdly, a widow that was but once married; fourthly, one of a considerable age, forty, fifty, or sixty years old: though all these rules admitted of exceptions. In Tertullian's time the deaconesses were so commonly chosen out of the widows, that, when a certain young virgin was made a deaconess, he speaks of it[7] 'as a miracle or monstrous thing in the Church.' Yet some learned men are of opinion that virgins were sometimes made dea-

Deaconesses to be widows by some laws.

[3] L. 10. Ep. 97. (pp. 278, 279.) Quo magis necessarium credidi, ex duabus ancillis, quæ ministræ dicebantur, quid esset veri et per tormenta quærere.

[4] Ad Uxor. l. 1. c. 7. (p. 165 c.) Quantum detrahant fidei quantum obstrepant sanctitati nuptiæ secundæ, disciplina ecclesiæ et præscriptio Apostoli declarat, cum digamos non sinit præsidere, cum viduam adlegi in ordinem, nisi univiram, non concedit. . . Sacerdotium viduitatis et cœlibatium [al. celebratum] est apud nationes. — De Virgin. Veland. c. 9. See the next section, n. 14, following.

[5] Hær. Collyrid. n. 4. (p. 1. 1060 d.) Παρατηρητέον δὲ, ὅτι ἄχρι διακονισσῶν μόνον τὸ ἐκκλησιαστικὸν ἐπεδεήθη τάγμα, χήρας τε ὠνόμασε, καὶ τούτων τὰς ἔτι γραοτέρας πρεσβύτιδας, οὐδαμοῦ δὲ πρεσβυτερίδας, ἢ ἱερίσσας προσέταξε. — Conf. Ignat. Ep. ad Smyrn. n. 13. See the next section, n. 8, following.

[6] C. 11. (t. 1. p. 1497 d.) Περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν τὰς λεγομένας πρεσβύτιδας, ἤτοι προκαθημένας, ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ καθίστασθαι.

[7] De Virgin. Veland. c. 9. (p. 178 b.) Plane scio alicubi virginem in viduatu ab annis nondum viginti collocatam; cui si quid refrigerii debuerat episcopus, aliter utique, salvo respectu disciplinæ, præstare potuisset, ne tale nunc miraculum, ne dixerim monstrum, in ecclesia denotaretur.

conesses even in the time of Ignatius; because Ignatius, in his Epistle to the Church of Smyrna[8] salutes 'the virgins that were called *widows*,' that is *deaconesses*, as Cotelerius and Vossius truly expound it: for virgins could not be called *widows* congruously in any other sense. Some suspect that the word *virgins* is a corruption crept into the text: but there is no reason for this conjecture, for Ignatius is not the only author that speaks of virgin-deaconesses. Epiphanius says[9], in his time 'they were some virgins, and some widows that had been but once married.' The author of the Constitutions[10] says the same, 'that the deaconess was either to be a chaste virgin, or a widow that had been the wife of one man.' And one of Justinian's Novels[11] enacted it into a law, that the deaconesses should be chosen out of one of these orders. Accordingly we find, in the practice of the Church, virgins as well as widows admitted to this office. Gregory Nyssen[12] says his own sister Macrina, who was a virgin, was a deaconess; and so was Lampadia, another virgin. And Sozomen[13] relates how that Chrysostom would have ordained Nicarete, a famous virgin, to this office; but she refused it for the love she had to a private and philosophic life.

id such dows as d children.

3. Yet by some laws they were required not only to be widows, but *such widows as* [had] *had children also.* Tertullian[14]

[8] Ep. ad Smyrn. n. 13. (Cotel. v. 2. p. 38.) Ἀσπάζομαι .. καὶ τὰς παρθένους τὰς λεγομένας χήρας.—Cotel. in l. c. (p. 39. sub fin. n. 24.) Viduæ vocabantur, quia in gradu viduali, seu diaconico, erant constitutæ.

[9] Expos. Fid. n. 21. (t. 1. p. 1104 b.) Καὶ αὗται δὲ μονόγαμοι ἐγκρατευσάμεναι, ἢ χηρεύσασαι ἀπὸ μονογαμίας, ἢ ἀειπάρθενοι οὖσαι.

[10] L. 6. c. 17. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 348.) Διακόνισσα δὲ γενέσθω παρθένος ἁγνή· εἰ δὲ μήγε, κἂν χήρα μονόγαμος, πιστὴ καὶ τιμία.

[11] Novel. 6. c. 6. (t. 5. p. 58.) ... Et aut virgines constitutas, aut unius viri quæ fuerant uxores.

[12] Vit. Macrin. (t. 2. pp. 180 c. 181 a. 197 c.) Πολλάκις αὐτῇ τοὺς περὶ τῶν γάμων προσαγαγόντων λόγους τῶν γεννησαμένων, διὰ τὸ πολλοὺς εἶναι τοὺς κατὰ φήμην τοῦ κάλλους μνηστεύειν ἐθέλοντας, ἄτοπον εἶναι ἔλεγε καὶ παράνομον, μὴ στέργειν τὸν ἅπαξ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῇ κυρωθέντα γάμον.... Ἐπεὶ ταῖς μυστικαῖς ὑπηρεσίαις τὰς χεῖρας ἑαυτῆς ἔχρισε, κ. τ. λ. .... Ἤν τις προτεταγμένη τοῦ χοροῦ τῶν παρθένων ἐν τῷ τῆς διακονίας βαθμῷ, Λαμπαδία ὄνομα αὐτῇ.

[13] L. 8. c. 23. (v. 2. p. 355. 43.) ... Καίπερ τοιάδε οὖσα, τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐλάνθανεν· ὑπὸ μετριότητος γὰρ τρόπων καὶ φιλοσοφίας ἀεὶ λανθάνειν ἐπετήδευεν· ὡς μήτε εἰς ἀξίωμα διακόνου σπουδάσαι προελθεῖν, μήτε προτρεπομένου πολλάκις Ἰωάννου ἑλέσθαι ποτὲ παρθένων ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἡγεῖσθαι.

[14] De Virgin. Veland. c. 9. (p. 178.) .... Ad quam sedem præter annos sexaginta non tantum univiræ, id est nuptæ, aliquando eliguntur, sed et matres, et quidem educatrices filiorum: scilicet ut experimentis omnium affectuum structæ facile norint cæteras et consilio et solatio juvare, &c.

seems to intimate that this was the custom of the age he lived in, to put none into this office but 'such as were mothers, and had had the education of children, in the training up of whom they had learnt to be tender and compassionate in their affections, and so were qualified to assist others both by their counsel and comfort.' Sozomen[15] also mentions a law made by Theodosius to this purpose, 'that no women should be admitted to the office except they had had children and were above sixty years old, according to the express rule of St. Paul.' The law is still extant in the Theodosian Code[16], in the same words as Sozomen cites; but he speaks of it as a new law, that was then made upon a particular occasion, by reason of some scandal that had happened in the Church. Which is a plain intimation that, from the time of Tertullian to the making of this law, the Church had varied in her practice.

Not to be ordained under sixty years of age, by the most ancient canons.

4. And so she had likewise with respect to *the age* of deaconesses. For, though the forementioned law of Theodosius require them to be sixty years of age complete, and Tertullian[17] and St. Basil[18] speak of the same age, yet Justinian in one of his Novels[19] requires but fifty, and in another[20] but forty: which is all that was insisted on before by the great Council of Chalcedon[21], whose words are, 'No woman shall be ordained a deaconess before she is forty years old.' And it is probable in some cases *that* term was not strictly required: for Sozomen says[22] Nectarius, bishop of Constantinople, ordained Olympias a deaconess, 'though she was but a young widow, be-

[15] L. 7. c. 16. (ibid. p. 301. 10.) .... Νομοθετῆσαι τὰς γυναῖκας, εἰ μὴ παῖδας ἔχοιεν, καὶ ὑπὲρ ἑξήκοντα ἔτη γένοιντο, διακονίαν Θεοῦ μὴ ἐπιτρέπεσθαι, κατὰ τὸ Ἀποστόλου Παύλου ῥητὸν πρόσταγμα.

[16] L. 16. tit. 2. de Episc. et Cler. leg. 27. (t. 6. p. 60.) Nulla nisi emensis sexaginta annis, cui votiva domi proles sit, secundum præceptum Apostoli ad diaconissarum consortium transferatur.

[17] Ibid. See n. 14, preceding.

[18] Ep. Canon. c. 24. (CC. t. 2. p. 1737 a.) Χήραν, τὴν καταλεγεῖσαν εἰς τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν χηρῶν, τουτέστι τὴν διακονουμένην ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἔκρινεν Ἀπόστολος γαμουμένην παρορᾶσθαι.

[19] Novel. 6. c. 6. (t. 5. p. 58.) ... Sed super mediam constitutas ætatem, et circa quinquaginta annos, &c.

[20] Novel. 123. c. 13. (t. 5. p. 546.) .... Diaconissam vero non ordinari in sancta ecclesia, quæ minor est annorum quadraginta, &c.

[21] C. 14. al. 15. (t. 4. p. 763 a.) Διάκονον μὴ χειροτονεῖσθαι γυναῖκα πρὸ ἐτῶν τεσσαράκοντα.—Vid. C. Trull. cc. 14 et 40.—See afterwards, sect. 6. n. 39, following.

[22] L. 8. c. 9. (ibid. p. 337. 21.)... Καίπερ νέαν χήραν γενομένην, εἰς ἄγαν δὲ φιλοσοφοῦσαν κατὰ τὸν τῆς ἐκκλησίας θεσμὸν, διάκονον ἐχειροτόνησε Νεκτάριος.

cause she was a person of extraordinary virtue.' By which we may judge, that as the Church varied in her rule about this matter, so bishops took a liberty to ordain deaconesses at what age they thought fit, provided they could be assured of their probity and virtue.

To be such as had been only the wives of one man.

5. But there was another qualification, which they were more strict in exacting, which was, that the deaconesses should be such widows *as had been only the wives of one man*, according to the Apostle's prescription, 1 Tim. 5, 9; which rule they generally understood as a prohibition of electing any to be deaconesses who had been twice married, though lawfully and successively, to two husbands one after another. In this sense Tertullian says[23] the Apostle requires them to be *univiræ, the wives of one man;* which Epiphanius[24] calls χηρεύσασαι ἀπὸ μονογαμίας, *widows that have been but once married.* So the author of the Constitutions and Justinian's Novels, which have been cited before[25].

But Theodoret gives a different sense of the Apostle's words; for he supposes the Apostle not to forbid the choosing of widows that had been twice married, but only such[26] *as had married again after they had divorced themselves from a former husband;* which was such a scandalous act, as justly excluded them from the Church's service. And this sense is embraced, as the most probable and rational, by the learned Justellus[27], Dr. Hammond[28], Suicerus[29], and several others;

[23] Ad Uxor. l. 1. c. 7. See s. 1. n. 4. preceding.—De Virgin. Veland. c. 9. See s. 2. n. 7, preceding.

[24] Expos. Fid. n. 21. (t. 1. p. 1104 b.) Καὶ διακόνισσαι δὲ καθίστανται εἰς ὑπηρεσίαν γυναικῶν μόνον, διὰ τὴν σεμνότητα, ἂν χρεία καταστάιη, λουτροῦ ἕνεκα, ἢ ἐπισκέψεως σωμάτων· καὶ αὗται δὲ μονόγαμοι ἐγκρατευσάμεναι ἢ χηρεύσασαι ἀπὸ μονογαμίας, ἢ ἀειπάρθενοι οὖσαι.

[25] See s. 2. notes 10 and 11, preceding.

[26] Vid. Theodor. in 1 Tim. 5, 9. (t. 3. part. 1. p. 664.) Γεγονυῖα ἑνὸς ἀνδρὸς γυνή· καὶ ἐντεῦθεν δῆλον, ὡς οὐ τὴν διγαμίαν ἐκβάλλει, ἀλλὰ τὸ σωφρόνως ἐν γάμῳ βιοῦν νομοθετεῖ· οὐ γὰρ ἄνω τὸν δεύτερον γάμον νομοθετήσας, σωματικῆς ἀπολαῦσαι θεραπείας ἐκώλυσε τὴν δευτέροις ὁμιλήσασαν γάμοις· ὅς γε τὸ ἀγαθὸν ποιεῖν πρὸς πάντας διαγορεύει σαφῶς.

[27] Ad c. 1. C. Laod. (t. 1. p. 83.) De tertia igitur, &c.—Ibid. (p. 84.) De hujusmodi igitur digamis accipienda sunt supra dicti canones, &c.

[28] Annot. on 1 Tim. 3, 2. (v. 3. p. 692.) A third sense, &c.

[29] Thes. Eccles. in vocibus διγαμία et δίγαμος. (t. 1. p. 899. ad Theodor. loc. supr. cit.) Τὸ, σωφρόνως ἐν γάμῳ βιοῦν, opponitur ei, quando uxor a marito divertit, et alii nubit, adeoque δίγαμος fit. Hoc enim *digamiæ* genus commune fuit tum viris, tum mulieribus, quibus æque apud Græcos et Romanos concessa divertendi licentia.

of which I shall have occasion to give a further account, when I come to speak of that apostolical rule as it concerned all the clergy. Thus much will suffice to be spoken at present concerning the qualifications of deaconesses before they were ordained.

Whether deaconesses were anciently ordained by imposition of hands.

6. The next inquiry is concerning *their ordination* itself,—whether it was always performed by imposition of hands? And here learned men are very much divided in their sentiments. Baronius[30] thinks they had no imposition of hands at the time of the Council of Nice; and he grounds his assertion upon one of the canons of that Council; which, as he expounds it, denies that deaconesses were ordained by imposition of hands, and therefore makes no other account of them than as mere lay-persons. Valesius[31] gives the same exposition of the canon; though he owns, that Balsamon and Zonaras, the ancient expositors, were of a contrary judgment, viz. 'that the canon speaks not of the deaconesses of the Church, but of such as returned to the Catholic Church from the Paulianists or Samosatenian heretics; among whom they had received no imposition of hands, and therefore were to be treated as mere laics.' And in this sense Suicerus[32], and Albaspiny[33], Christianus Lupus[34], Fabrotus[35], and other modern critics and

[30] An. 34. n. 283. (t. 1. p. 237 c.) Quantumlibet prædicta diaconissæ curarent, non tamen erant ejusmodi, ut, sicut diaconi, manus impositionem acciperent, vel aliquo sacramento initiatæ essent: nam sacrosancta Nicæna synodus ea ex causa easdem inter laicas annumerat.—Conf. Cabassut. Notit. Concil. c. 56. p. 342. [al. de Diaconiss. dissert. 2. ss. 6, 7.] (p. 26.) Etiamsi doctissimus Baronius, &c.

[31] Not. in Sozom. l. 8. c. 9. (ibid. n. 3.) Apud antiquos alius mos fuit, ut docet canon 19. Concilii Nicæni. In quo sancti patres generaliter pronuntiant, diaconissas manus impositionem non habere, easque inter laicos esse numerandas. Quamquam Zonaras et Balsamo canonem illum Concilii Nicæni non generaliter de omnibus diaconissis, sed tantum de diaconissis Paulianistarum, quæ ad catholicam ecclesiam redirent, intelligendum putarunt. Sed verba ipsa canonis illius abunde eos refutant, &c.

[32] Thes. Eccles. in voce διακόνισσα. n. 5. (t. 1. p. 867.) Satis intricata et vexata quæstio est, An diaconissæ laicis fuerint annumeratæ? Consult the entire section.

[33] Not. in c. 19. Nicæn. (CC. t. 2. p. 83 d.) . . . Cum synodus quasdam, quæ minus recte et extra ordinem institutæ essent, inter laicos deputandas esse censet; subintelligendum profecto relinquit, quasdam fuisse, quæ rite et ordine consecratæ essent. Denique quid toto canone statuitur? quid præcipitur? quæ est ejus sententia? si ab hæresi redeuntes diaconissas eundem jubet apud orthodoxos honoris locum retinere, quem inter hæreticos obtinuerant; nonne sequitur quasdam fuisse, quæ initiatæ et consecratæ essent?

[34] Schol. in eund. can. (t. 1. p. 266. col. dextr.) Eandem gratiam canon extendit ad diaconissas, &c.

[35] Not. ad Balsam. Collect. Con-

expositors of the canon explain it also. To make the reader himself judge in the matter, I must here recite the words of the canon[36], which are these: 'Concerning the Paulianists which return to the Catholic Church, it is decreed, that they shall be by all means rebaptized: and if any of them were heretofore reckoned among the clergy, if they appear to be blameless and without rebuke, let them be first baptized, and then ordained by the bishop of the Catholic Church: but if, upon examination, they be found unfit, let them be deposed. The same rule shall be observed concerning deaconesses, and all others who are reckoned among their clergy. And we particularly take notice of deaconesses, which appear in that habit or dignity, that having never had any imposition of hands, they are to be reckoned only among the laity.' These last words about deaconesses seem to refer to what goes before; and then they must be interpreted of deaconesses among the Paulianists, who took upon them the habit of deaconesses without any consecration. Or, if we understand them as spoken of deaconesses already in the Church, they may mean that there were some deaconesses which had crept into the office without imposition of hands, and such the Council accounts no more than lay-persons. That which will incline a man to interpret this canon to some such sense as this is, that all other Councils and writers speak of ordaining deaconesses by imposition of hands. Valesius himself owns that it was so in the time of the Council of Chalcedon; for in one of the

stit. ap. Justel. in Bibl. Jur. Canon. (t. 2. p. 1417.) Videamus obiter an diaconissæ inter laicos censerentur: et in ea quidem sententia sunt viri docti, quibus erroris fundus est canon 19. Concilii Nicæni..... Certe nec ipse Zonaras, nec quidam recentiores videntur eum percepisse. Hoc igitur constitutum est in [dicto] canone, ut diaconissæ, quæ ab hæresi Paulianorum ad ecclesiam redierint, rebaptizentur, et iis quæ in eodem habitu esse noscuntur, quod nimirum non habeant manuum impositionem, adeo ut omnino inter laicos deputentur, manus imponantur, anno 40,..... si inveniantur idoneæ; alioquin manus non imponantur.

[36] C. Nicæn. c. 19. (t. 2. p. 37 d.) *Περὶ τῶν Παυλιανιστάντων, εἶτα προσφυγόντων τῇ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ὅρος ἐκτέθειται ἀναβαπτίζεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐξάπαντος· εἰ δέ τινες ἐν τῷ παρεληλυθότι χρόνῳ ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ ἐξητάσθησαν, εἰ μὲν ἄμεμπτοι καὶ ἀνεπίληπτοι φανεῖεν, ἀναβαπτισθέντες χειροτονείσθωσαν ὑπὸ τοῦ τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπισκόπου· εἰ δὲ ἡ ἀνάκρισις ἀνεπιτηδείους αὐτοὺς εὑρίσκοι, καθαιρεῖσθαι αὐτοὺς προσήκει· ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ περὶ τῶν διακονισσῶν, καὶ ὅλως περὶ τῶν ἐν τῷ κανόνι ἐξεταζομένων, ὁ αὐτὸς τύπος παραφυλαχθήσεται· ἐμνήσθημεν δὲ διακονισσῶν τῶν ἐν τῷ σχήματι ἐξετασθεισῶν, ἐπεὶ μηδὲ χειροθεσίαν τινὰ ἔχουσιν, ὥστε ἐξάπαντος ἐν τοῖς λαϊκοῖς αὐτὰς ἐξετάζεσθαι.*

canons of that Council[37] their ordination is expressly called both χειροτονία and χειροθεσία, *ordination by imposition of hands.* And the author of the Constitutions[38], speaking of their ordination, requires the bishop to use imposition of hands with a form of prayer which is there recited. And thus it was, both in the Greek and Latin Church, so long as the order itself continued to be in use. The Council of Trullo, anno 692, speaks of their ordination in two canons[39], under the name of χειροτονία: and Sozomen[40] uses the same word in speaking of the ordination of Olympias. And though there be not so many examples of this practice to be met with in the Latin Church, because the order was there much sooner laid aside, yet Cotelerius[41] has furnished us with some out of Fortunatus and the Council of Worms, both which expressly say the ordination of deaconesses was performed by imposition of hands. In the Council of Worms the 15th canon of the Council of Chalcedon is repeated[42]. And Fortunatus's words are[43], *manu superposita consecravit diaconam*, speaking of one whom Medardus the bishop consecrated a deaconess *by laying his hands upon her.* All which shews that it was the constant practice of the Church to ordain deaconesses by imposition of hands; and that makes it very probable that the Nicene canon is to be understood in that sense which is most agreeable to the Church's practice.

But the learned Justellus[44] still raises another scruple about

[37] C. 15. (t. 4. p. 763 a.) Διακόνισσαν μὴ χειροτονεῖσθαι γυναῖκα, πρὸ ἐτῶν τεσσαράκοντα, καὶ ταύτην μετὰ ἀκριβοῦς δοκιμασίας· εἰ δέ γε δεξαμένη τὴν χειροθεσίαν, καὶ χρόνον τινὰ παραμείνασα τῇ λειτουργίᾳ, ἑαυτὴν ἐπιδῷ γάμῳ, ὑβρίσασα τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριν, ἡ τοιαύτη ἀναθεματιζέσθω μετὰ τοῦ αὐτῇ συναφθέντος.

[38] L. 8. c. 19. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 407.) Περὶ δὲ διακονίσσης Βαρθολομαῖος διατάσσομαι· ὦ ἐπίσκοπε, ἐπιθήσεις αὐτῇ τὰς χεῖρας, παρεστῶτος τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου, καὶ τῶν διακόνων, καὶ τῶν διακονισσῶν, καὶ ἐρεῖς· ὁ Θεὸς, κ. τ. λ. (Vid. c. 20. p. 408.)

[39] C. 14. (t. 6. p. 1150 b.) Μήτε διακόνισσα πρὸ τῶν μ' χρόνων χειροτονείσθω.—C. 40. (p. 1162 c.) Οἱ ἱεροὶ κανόνες τεσσαράκοντα ἐτῶν τὴν διακόνισσαν χειροτονεῖσθαι παραδεδώκασι.

[40] L. 8. c. 9. See s. 4. p. 287. n. 22.

[41] In loc. ad verb. Ἐπιθήσεις αὐτῇ τὰς χεῖρας. (v. 1. p. 407. n. 84.) Frequentissime Græci, rarissime Latini. Præter Wormatienses patres ex Concilio Chalcedonensi, Fortunatus in Vita Radegundis, 'Manu superposita consecravit diaconam' Medardus episcopus.

[42] C. 73. ex C. Chalced. c. 15. (t. 8. p. 958 e.) Diaconissam non ordinandam ante annum quadragesimum, &c.

[43] Vit. Radegund. [l. 1. c. 6.] ap. Surium, Aug. 13. (t. 4. p. 655.)

[44] Not. in C. Nicæn. c. 19. (t. 1. p. 75.) Duplex enim olim fuit χειρο-

their ordination. He thinks this imposition of hands was not properly an ordination, but only a benediction; for he distinguishes betwixt those two things, and says, 'Every solemn imposition of hands is not an ordination:' which is very true; for then the imposition of hands upon the catechumens, or upon the baptized in confirmation, or upon the penitents in order to reconcile them, or upon the sick in order to their cure, or upon any persons whatsoever to give them a common benediction, would be an ordination. But then that learned person seems not to have considered, that the imposition of hands upon the deaconesses was something more than all these; for it was a consecration of them to a certain office in the Church: which sort of imposition of hands, joined with a prayer of benediction for grace to discharge that office aright, is what the Church has always meant, and called particularly by the name of *ordination*.

7. Yet we are not to imagine that this consecration gave them any power to execute any part of the sacerdotal office, or do the duties of the sacred function. Women were always forbidden to perform any such offices as those. Therefore the author of the Constitutions[45] calls it a heathenish practice *to ordain women priests*, ἱερείας χειροτονεῖν; for the Christian law allowed no such custom. Some heretics, indeed, as Tertullian[46] observes[46], allowed women to teach, and exorcise, and administer baptism: but all this, he says, was against the rule of the Apostle[47]. Epiphanius brings the charge particularly

θεσία, εὐλογίας videlicet et χειροτονίας, ut ait Tharasius Patriarcha CP. Act. 1. Concil. Nicæni 2. t. 3. Concil.: nec χειροθεσία semper fuit consecrationis symbolum, sed et orationis super hominem cui manus imponebantur..... Impositio vero manuum benedictionis adhiberi fuit solita, ut diximus, lapsis pœnitentibus, et redeuntibus ab hæreticis ad veram ecclesiam.

[45] L. 3. c. 9. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 282.) Εἰ δὲ ἐν τοῖς προλαβοῦσι διδάσκειν αὐταῖς οὐκ ἐπετρέψαμεν, πῶς ἱερατεῦσαι ταύταις παρὰ φύσιν τις συγχωρήσει; τοῦτο γὰρ τῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀθεότητος τὸ ἀγνόημα, θηλείαις θεαῖς ἱερείας χειροτονεῖν.

[46] De Præscript. c. 41. (p. 217 c.) Ipsæ mulieres hæreticæ quam procaces! quæ audeant docere, contendere, exorcismos agere, curationes repromittere, forsitan [al. fortasse an] et tingere?

[47] De Bapt. c. 17. (p. 231 b.) Petulantia autem mulieris, quæ usurpavit docere, utique non etiam tinguendi jus sibi pariet: nisi si quæ nova bestia evenerit similis pristinæ: ut quemadmodum illa baptismum auferebat, ita aliqua per se eum conferat. Quod si quæ Paulo perperam adscripta sunt, ad licentiam mulierum docendi tinguendique defendunt; sciant in Asia presbyterum, qui eam scripturam construxit, quasi titulo Pauli de suo cumulans, convictum atque confes-

against the Pepuzians, which were a branch of the Montanists[48], 'that they made women bishops, and women presbyters, abusing that passage of the Apostle, "In Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female," to put some colour upon their practice.' He charges it also upon the Collyridians[49], 'that they did ἱερουργεῖν διὰ γυναικῶν, *use women to sacrifice to the Virgin Mary;*' where it is observed that the charge is double: first, that they gave divine worship to the holy Virgin; and secondly, that they used women-priests in their service. Against these he has a particular dissertation, wherein he shews at large that no woman, from the foundation of the world, was ever ordained to offer sacrifice, or perform any solemn service[50] of the Church; which, if it had been allowed to any, would certainly have been granted to the Virgin Mary herself, who was so highly favoured of God. But neither she nor any other woman had ever the priest's office committed to them. 'There is indeed,' says he[51], 'an order of deaconesses in the Church, but their business is not to sacrifice, or perform any part of the sacerdotal office or any of the sacred mysteries, but to be a decent help to the female sex in the time of their baptism, sickness, affliction, or the like:' and therefore he denies that the Church made them either *presbyteresses or priestesses*, ἢ πρεσβυτερίδας, ἢ ἱερίσσας; where the reader is to observe, that Epiphanius puts a distinction betwixt the names

sum id se amore Pauli fecisse, loco decessisse. Quam enim fidei proximum videretur, ut is docendi et tinguendi daret feminæ potestatem, qui ne discere quidem constanter mulieri permisit? Taceant, inquit, et domi maritos suos consulant.

[48] Hær. 49. Pepuz. n. 2. (t. 1. p. 418 d.) Ἐπίσκοποι παρ' αὐτοῖς γυναῖκες, καὶ πρεσβύτεροι γυναῖκες, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα.

[49] Hær. 78. Antidicomar. n. 23. (t. 1. pp. 1054 d. & 1055 a.) Ὡς εἰς ὄνομα τῆς ἀειπαρθένου κολλυρίδα τινὰ ἐπιτελεῖν..... Καὶ εἰς ὄνομα τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου ὑπὲρ τὸ μέτρον τὶ πειρᾶσθαι ἀθεμίτῳ καὶ βλασφήμῳ ἐπιχειρεῖν πράγματι, καὶ εἰς ὄνομα αὐτῆς ἱερουργεῖν διὰ γυναικῶν. [Towards the close of his strictures on the Antidicomarianitæ he alludes to those who went to the other extreme, viz. the Collyridians, whom he confutes under that title in the next Heresy. They were so termed because they offered in sacrifice to the Virgin a peculiar kind of roll or biscuit, or paste wafer, called κολλυρίς. See the first clause of this citation. Ed.]

[50] Hær. 79. Collyrid. n. 3. (t. 1. p. 1059 d.) Εἰ ἱερατεύειν γυναῖκες Θεῷ προσετάσσοντο, ἢ κανονικὸν τὶ ἐργάζεσθαι ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἔδει μᾶλλον αὐτὴν τὴν Μαρίαν ἱερατείαν ἐπιτελέσαι, &c.

[51] Ibid. (p. 1060 c.) Καὶ ὅτι μὲν διακονισσῶν τάγμα ἔστιν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ εἰς τὸ ἱερατεύειν, οὐδὲ τὶ ἐπιχειρεῖν ἐπιτρέπειν.

πρεσβύτιδας and πρεσβυτέριδας[52], because the former only denotes *elderly women*, such as the deaconesses commonly were: but the latter he uses to signify *persons ordained to the office of presbyters* or priests, which he absolutely denies any women in the Christian Church to be.

8. And from hence it is plain the offices of the deaconesses were only to perform some inferior services of the Church, and those chiefly relating to the women, for whose sake they were ordained. One part of their office was *to assist the minister at the baptizing of women;* where, for decency's sake, they were employed to divest them, the custom then being to baptize all adult persons by immersion, and so to order the matter that the whole ceremony might be performed with all the decency becoming so sacred an action. This is evident from Epiphanius, both in the fore-cited passage and other places[53]; and it is taken notice of also by Justinian[54] and the author of the Constitutions[55], who adds, 'that the deaconesses were used to anoint the women in baptism with the holy oil;' as the custom of the Greek Church then was, not only for the bishops, presbyters, and deacons, but also for the deaconesses to use this ceremony of unction before baptism: of which Cotelerius in his Notes[56] gives several instances out of the ancient writers, but these belong to another place.

[52] Ibid. n. 4. (d.) Χήρας τε ὠνόμασε, καὶ τούτων τὰς ἔτι γραυτέρας πρεσβύτιδας, οὐδαμοῦ δὲ πρεσβυτερίδας, ἢ ἱερίσσας προσέταξεν.

[53] Epiph. Expos. Fid. n. 21. See s. 5. p. 288. n. 24. and s. 9. n. 59, following.

[54] Novel. 6. c. 6. (t. 5. p. 58.) ... Sed nec suspectam omnino ad sacrum venire officium, et adorandis ministrare baptismatibus, et aliis adesses secretis, quæ in venerabilibus ministeriis per eas rite aguntur.

[55] L. 3. c. 15. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 287.) ... Καὶ πρῶτον μὲν ἐν τῷ φωτίζεσθαι γυναῖκας, ὁ διάκονος χρίσει μὲν μόνον τὸ μέτωπον αὐτῷ τῷ ἁγίῳ ἐλαίῳ· καὶ μετ' αὐτὸν ἡ διάκονος ἀλείψει αὐτάς.

[56] [In l. c. (ibid. n. 79.) Hoc etiam loco ad baptizandas feminas adhibentur diaconissæ, ut eas inungant, neve a viris adspiciantur nudæ. Et quidem quod spectat ad unctionem, illustre habemus in Joannis Moschi Prato Spirituali, c. 3., exemplum, de Conone presbytero, cui in cœnobio ibi memorato baptismum accedentibus conferre demandatum fuerat. Αὐτὸς δὲ ἔχριεν καὶ ἐβάπτισεν τοὺς ἐπὶ τοῦτο παραγενομένους· καθ' ὅτι οὖν ἔχριεν γυναῖκα, ἐσκανδαλίζετο. Ἐν μίᾳ οὖν ἦλθεν κόρη Περσία ἐπὶ τὸ βαπτισθῆναι· ἦν δὲ εὐειδὴς πάνυ ὡραία, ὥστε μὴ δυνηθῆναι τὸν πρεσβύτερον αὐτὴν χρῖσαι τῷ ἁγίῳ ἐλαίῳ· καὶ ποιησάσης αὐτῆς δύο ἡμέρας, ἤκουσεν ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Πέτρος, ἐξεπλάγη ἐπὶ τῷ γεγονότι, καὶ ἠθέλησεν ἀφορίσαι διάκονον γυναῖκα ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτῷ· ἀλλὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐποίησεν, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἐπιδέχεσθαι τὸν τόπον. ... Ambrosius Camaldulensis vertit, 'ne contra canones fecisse videretur,' quia male legebat τύπον, quemadmodum pro γεγονότι, γέροντι. *Grischov.*]

9. Another part of their office was to be *a sort of private catechists* to the women-catechumens, who were preparing for baptism: for though they were not allowed to teach publicly in the church, yet they might privately instruct and teach those how to make the proper answers that were required of all persons at their baptism. The author of the Short Notes on the Epistles under the name of St. Jerom[57], calls this 'private ministry of the word,' which the deaconesses performed in the Eastern Churches in his time. And it was so usual and ordinary a part of their office in the African Churches, that the fathers of the fourth Council of Carthage[58] require it as a necessary qualification in deaconesses, when they are ordained, 'that they shall be persons of such good understanding, as to be able to instruct the ignorant and rustic women how to make responses to the interrogatories which the minister puts to them in baptism, and how they were to order their conversation afterward.'

2. To be sort of p vate cat chists to the wom catechu-mens.

10. Another part of their employment was *to visit and attend women that were sick:* which is noted by Epiphanius[59], and the author of the Constitutions[60], who says 'they were employed likewise in delivering the bishop's messages and directions to women that were in health, whom the deacons could not visit because of unbelievers; that is, because of the scandal and reproach which the heathens were ready to cast upon them.

3. To vis and atter women tl were sick and in di tress.

11. In times of danger and persecution they were employed

4. To mi nister to t

[57] In Rom. 16, 1. (t. 2. p. 898 b.) Sicut etiam nunc in orientalibus diaconissæ mulieres in suo sexu ministrare videntur in baptismo, sive in ministerio verbi, quia privatim docuisse feminas invenimus, &c.

[58] C. 12. (t. 2. p. 1201 a.) Viduæ vel sanctimoniales, quæ ad ministerium baptizandarum mulierum eliguntur, tam instructæ sint ad officium, ut possint apto et sano sermone docere imperitas et rusticas mulieres, tempore quo baptizandæ sunt, qualiter baptizatori interrogatæ respondeant, et qualiter accepto baptismate vivant.

[59] Hær. 79. Collyrid. n. 3. (t. 1. p. 1060 c.) Ἕνεκεν δὲ σεμνότητος τοῦ γυναικείου γένους, ἢ δι' ὅραν λουτροῦ, ἢ ἐπισκέψεως πάθους, ἢ πόνου, ἢ ὅτε γυμνωθείη σῶμα γυναίου, ἵνα μὴ ὑπὸ ἀνδρῶν ἱερουργούντων θεαθείη, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τῆς διακονούσης. See also s. 5. p. 288. n. 24.

[60] L. 3. c. 15. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 287.) Προχείρισαι δὲ καὶ διάκονον πιστὴν καὶ ἁγίαν εἰς τὰς τῶν γυναικῶν ὑπηρεσίας· ἔστι γὰρ ὁπόταν ἔν τισιν οἰκίαις ἄνδρα διάκονον γυναιξὶν οὐ δύναται πέμπειν διὰ τοὺς ἀπίστους· ἀποστελεῖς οὖν γυναῖκα διάκονον διὰ τὰς τῶν φαύλων διανοίας.—Ibid. c. 19. (p. 289.) .... Καὶ ἡ μὲν γυνὴ τὰς γυναῖκας σπουδάζουσα θεραπεύειν.—Conf. Hieron. Ep. 2. [al. 52.] ad Nepot. (t. 1. p. 258 a.) Multas anus alit ecclesia, quæ officium ægrotanti præstant, &c.

Martyrs and confessors in prison.

in *ministering to the martyrs in prison:* because they could more easily gain access to them, and go with less suspicion, and less danger and hazard to their lives from the heathen, than the deacons or any other ministers of the Church could do. Cotelerius[61] and Gothofred[62] collect this from some passages in Lucian and Libanius, which seem plainly to refer to this part of the deaconesses' ministry. For Lucian, in one of his Dialogues, speaking of Peregrine the philosopher, how he was caressed by the Christians whilst he was in prison for the profession of their religion, says[63], 'In the morning one might observe old women, the widows, waiting at the prison gate with some of the orphan children;' where by 'the widows' he doubtless means *the deaconesses of the Christians.* And there is little question but Libanius means the same, when he says[64], 'that the mother or mistress of the old women, when she finds any one bound in prison, runs about and begs and makes a collection for him.' This plainly refers to the great charity and liberality of the Christians toward their martyrs, which was collected and sent to them by the hands of these deaconesses.

12. To attend the women's gate in the church.

12. In the Greek Churches the deaconesses had also the charge of the doors of the church; which part of their office is mentioned by the author of the Constitutions[65], and the author under the name of Ignatius[66], who styles them *φρουροὺς τῶν ἁγίων πυλώνων, the keepers of the holy gates.* But probably this was only in such Churches as made a distinction betwixt

[61] Not. in Constit. Apost. l. 3. c. 15. (v. 1. p. 287. n. 79.) Denique ad diaconas pertinuisse puto visitationem carcere detentorum, nec non collectionem pecuniæ ad liberandos eos. Id sane innuunt Lucianus et Libanius, &c. [See the following notes.]

[62] In Cod. Theod. l. 16. tit. 2. leg. 27. (t. 6. p. 61.)

[63] De Mort. Peregrin. (v. 18. p. 279.) Παρὰ τῷ δεσμωτηρίῳ περιμένοντα γραΐδια, χήρας τινὰς, καὶ παιδία ὀρφανά.

[64] Orat. 16. in Tisamen. juxt. Ed. Morel. p. 452 c. 3. (ap. Cotel. t. 1. p. 287. n. 79.) .... Μητέρα δὲ γραῶν, εἴπερ εἴη τῷ δεδεμένῳ, πλανωμένην ἀγείρειν ὅσον προσαιτοῦσα δύνηται, κ. τ. λ. [Conf. Orat. de Vinctis, quam Jacobo Gotofredo debemus. (Cotel. ibid.) Ταῦτα εἰπὼν ἀκούει· διατί οὐ καλεῖς διὰ τῶν δὶ τῶν [Malim ita, quam ut editum est διὰ τῶν δετῶν, per vinctos] ἐξιόντων γυναῖκα δεῦρο τῶν ἐπὶ φιλανθρωπίᾳ φιλοτιμουμένων, εἶτ' αὐτῆς πρὸς τὰ γόνατα προσπεσὼν πείθεις προσαιτοῦσαν ἄγειν τί σοι; *Grischov.*]

[65] L. 8. c. 28. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 411.) Διακόνισσα οὐκ εὐλογεῖ· ἀλλ' οὐδέ τι ὧν ποιοῦσιν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, ἢ οἱ διάκονοι, ἐπιτελεῖ· ἀλλ' ἢ τοῦ φυλάττειν τὰς θύρας, κ. τ. λ.

[66] Ep. ad Antioch. n. 12. (Cotel. v. 2. p. 112.) Ἀσπάζομαι τὰς φρουροὺς τῶν ἁγίων πυλώνων, τὰς ἐν Χριστῷ διακόνους.

the men's gate and the women's gate; for bishop Usher observes[67], that no ancient writers besides these two make any mention of this as part of the office of deaconesses. And in another place of the Constitutions[68] this distinction is plainly expressed: 'Let the door-keepers stand at the gate of the men, and the deaconesses at the gate of the women.'

13. Lastly, they were to assign all women their places, and regulate[69] their behaviour in the church: to preside over the rest of the widows[70], whence, in some canons, they are styled *προκαθημέναι, governesses*, as Balsamon and Zonaras note upon the Council of Laodicea[71]: and if any woman had any suit to prefer to a deacon or a bishop, a deaconess[72] was to introduce her. These were the offices of the deaconesses in the primitive Church, which I have been a little more particular in describing, because they are not now so commonly known, the order itself having been for some ages wholly laid aside.

6. To preside over the widows, &c.

14. If it be inquired how long this order continued in the Church, and what time it was totally abolished? I answer:—it was not laid aside everywhere at once, but continued in the Greek Church longer than in the Latin, and in some of the Latin Churches longer than in others. In the Greek Church they continued to the time of Balsamon, that is, to the latter end of the twelfth century; for he speaks of them[73] as then

How long this order continued in the Church.

[67] Dissert. 16. in Ignat. (Cotel. ibid. p. 224.) .... Diaconissis portarum committit custodiam, quod veterum alius facit nullus, &c.

[68] L. 2. c. 57. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 263.) *Στηκέτωσαν δὲ οἱ μὲν πυλωροὶ εἰς τὰς εἰσόδους τῶν ἀνδρῶν, φυλάσσοντες αὐτὰς, αἱ δὲ διάκονοι εἰς τὰς τῶν γυναικῶν.*

[69] L. 2. c. 58. (Cotel. ibid. p. 267.) *Εἰ δὲ πτωχὸς, ἢ ἀγενὴς, ἢ ξένος ἐπέλθοι, πρεσβύτης, ἢ νέος τῇ ἡλικίᾳ, καὶ τόπος οὐχ ὑπάρχει, καὶ τούτοις τόπον ποιήσει ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ ὁ διάκονος ... τῷ δὲ αὐτῷ ποιείτω καὶ ἡ διάκονος ταῖς ἐπερχομέναις γυναιξὶ πτωχαῖς, ἤτοι πλουσίαις.*

[70] Ibid. l. 3. c. 7. [This reference is erroneous. Perhaps the author alludes to the conclusion of the chapter cited, (Cotel. ibid. p. 280.) where it is said that the widows ought to be,—*πειθομένας τοῖς ἐπισκόποις, καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις, καὶ τοῖς διακόνοις, ἔτι μὴν ταῖς διακόνοις.* Ed.]

[71] C. 11. See s. 1. p. 285. n. 6.

[72] Vid. Constit. Apost. l. 2. c. 26. (Cotel. ibid. p. 239.) ... *Ἄνευ τῆς διακόνου μηδεμία προσίτω γυνὴ τῷ διακόνῳ ἢ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ.*

[73] Respons. ad Interrog. Marci. c. 35. ap. Leunclav. Jus. Gr. Rom. l. 5. (t. 1. p. 381.) *Πάλαι ποτὲ καὶ τάγματα διακονισσῶν τοῖς κανόνι ἐπεγινώσκετο, καὶ εἶχον καὶ αὗται βαθμὸν ἐν τῷ βήματι· ἡ δὲ τῶν ἐμμήνων κάκωσις τὴν ὑπηρεσίαν ταύτην ἐκ τοῦ θείου καὶ ἁγίου βήματος ἀπεξένωσε· παρὰ δὲ τῇ ἁγιωτάτῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θρόνου τῶν Κωνσταντινοπολιτῶν διακόνισσαι προχειρίζονται μίαν μὲν μετουσίαν μὴ ἔχουσαι ἐν τῷ βήματι, ἐκκλησιάζουσαι δὲ τὰ πολλὰ, καὶ τὴν γυναικωνῖτιν ἐκκλησιαστικῶς διορθούμεναι.*

ministering in the Church of Constantinople; though it appears from some other passages of the same author[74] that in other Churches they were generally laid aside. In the Latin Church there were some decrees made against their ordination long before: for the first Council of Orange, anno 441, forbids[75] any more deaconesses to be ordained; and the Council of Epone[76], anno 517, has a canon to the same purpose, wholly abrogating their consecration; not long after which the second Council of Orleans, anno 533, renewed the decree[77] against them; and before any of these, the Council of Laodicea, in the Eastern Church, had forbidden them under the name of ancient widows or governesses, decreeing[78] 'that no such for the future should be constituted in the Church.' But these decrees had no effect at all in the East, nor did they universally take effect in the West till many ages after. The author indeed under the name of St. Ambrose would lead an unwary reader into a great mistake; for he makes[79] as if the order of deaconesses was nowhere used but among the Montanists, ignorantly confounding the presbyteresses of the Montanists with the deaconesses of the Church. And the author under the name of St. Jerom[80] is not much more to be regarded, when he seems to intimate that in his time the order of deaconesses was wholly laid aside in the West, and only retained in the Oriental Churches. For I have already shewed[81] from Venan-

[74] C. Chalced. c. 15. (p. 340 c.) Τὰ τοῦ παρόντος κανόνος πάντη ἐσχόλασεν· διακόνισσα γὰρ σήμερον οὐ χειροτονεῖται, κἂν καταχρηστικῶς τινὲς τῶν ἀσκητριῶν διακόνισσαι λέγωνται.

[75] C. 26. (t. 3. p. 1431 b.) Diaconissæ omnimodis non ordinandæ, &c.

[76] C. 21. (t. 4. p. 1578 e.) Viduarum consecrationem, quas diaconissas vocant, ab omni religione nostra penitus abrogamus.

[77] C. 17. (ibid. p. 1782 c.) Placuit ut nulli postmodum feminæ diaconalis benedictio pro conditionis hujus fragilitate credatur.

[78] C. 11. See s. 1. p. 285. n. 6.

[79] In 1 Tim. 3, 11. (Oper. Ambros. t. 2. append. p. 295 b.) Cataphrygæ erroris occasionem captantes, propter quod post diaconos mulieres alloquitur, etiam ipsas diaconas ordinari debere vana præsumtione defendunt, cum sciant Apostolos septem diaconos elegisse. Numquid nulla mulier tunc idonea inventa est, cum inter undecim Apostolos sanctas mulieres fuisse legamus? sed ut hæretici animum suum verbis, non sensu legis abstruere videantur, Apostoli verbis contra sensum nituntur Apostoli, ut cum ille mulierem in ecclesia in silentio esse debere præcipiat, illi e contra etiam auctoritatem in ecclesia vindicent ministerii.

[80] In Rom. 16, 1. See s. 9. n. 57, preceding. [Cf. in 1 Tim. 3, 11. (t. 2. p. 1048 c.) Unde intelligitur quod de his dicat, quas adhuc hodie in Oriente diaconissas appellant. Ed.]

[81] S. 6. See nn. 42 and 43, preceding.

tius Fortunatus who lived anno 560, and the Council of Worms which was held in the ninth century, that deaconesses were still retained in some parts of the Western Church; which may be evinced also from the *Ordo Romanus*[82], and other Rituals in use about that time, where among other forms we meet with an *Ordo ad diaconam faciendam, An order or form to consecrate a deaconess.* But in an age or two after, that is in the tenth or eleventh century, Bona[83] thinks the whole order was quite extinct.

Another notion of the name *diaconissa*, as it signifies a deacon's wife.

15. Before I make an end of this subject, I cannot but acquaint the reader that there is another notion of the name *diaconissa*, sometimes to be met with in the writers of the middle ages of the Church, who use it to signify not a deaconess, but *a deacon's wife*, in the same sense as *presbytera* signifies *the wife of a presbyter*, and *episcopa the wife of a bishop.* The word *episcopa* is thus used in the second Council of Tours[84], where it is said, 'that if a bishop have not a wife there shall no train of women follow him.' So also the words *presbytera, diaconissa*, and *subdiaconissa*, for the *wives of a presbyter, a deacon*, and *a subdeacon*, occur a little after[85] in the same Council; and so in the Council of Auxerre[86], and some other places. From which a learned and ingenious examiner[87] of the Council of Trent concludes, that bishops in those times were not as yet obliged by the law of celibacy not to cohabit with their wives, in the Gallican Church. But I shall freely own I take this to be a mistake: for from the time of Pope Siricius the celibacy of the clergy began to be pressed

[82] Ap. Bibl. Patr. t. 9. Paris. 1624. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 13. p. 736. c. 6. Lugdun. 1677.)

[83] Rer. Liturg. l. 1 c. 25. n. 15. (p. 266.) Ante annos fere sexcentos cessavit in Occidente earum ordinatio et ministerium: in Oriente vero jam desierat, vivente Balsamone, ut ipse ait in Notis ad can. 15. Concilii Chalcedonen. [(p. 340.) Quæ in præsenti canone tractantur omnino exolevere. Diaconissa hodie non ordinatur, &c. Ed.]

[84] C. 14. [al. 13.] (t. 5. p. 855 e.) Episcopum episcopam non habentem nulla sequatur turba mulierum.

[85] C. 20. [al. 19.] (ibid. p. 858 a.) Si inventus fuerit presbyter cum sua presbytera, aut diaconus cum sua diaconissa, aut subdiaconus cum sua subdiaconissa, annum integrum excommunicatus habeatur.

[86] C. 21. (t. 5. p. 959 d.) Non licet presbytero, post acceptam benedictionem, in uno lecto cum presbytera sua dormire, nec in peccato carnali misceri, nec diacono, aut subdiacono.

[87] Gentiletus, Exam. C. Trident. l. 4. [Sess. 24. n. 4.] p. 259. (p. 257.) [Quod satis arguit eo tempore episcopos habuisse uxores, quæ episcopæ appellatæ sint, &c. Ed.]

in the Western Church, and these very canons do enforce it; therefore I lay no greater stress upon these than they will bear: for, as for the cause of the married clergy, it needs not be defended by such arguments, having the rule and practice of the whole Catholic Church for some of the purest ages to abet and support it. Of which I shall give a just account hereafter, when I come to consider the general qualifications that were necessarily required of the clergy of the primitive Church, among which the vow of celibacy will be found to have no place. What therefore these canons mean by *episcopa* and *presbytera*, is no more than *the wife of a bishop* or *presbyter*, which they had before they were ordained, but in those declining ages of the Church were not allowed to cohabit with them after ordination. This explication agrees both with the scope of those canons, and the practice of the times they were made in; and we have no dispute with Antonius Augustinus[58], nor any candid writer of the Romish Communion, who carry this notion no higher than the ages in which it was broached. But when Baronius[59] and others transfer it to the primitive ages, and make the practice of the Western Church in the sixth age to be the practice of the Universal Church in all ages, they manifestly prevaricate, and put a fallacy upon their readers, which it may be sufficient to have hinted here, and shall be more fully made out in its proper place.

[58] De Emend. Gratian. l. 1. dial. 20. (p. 226.) Sed quid dicis de episcopa, presbytera, &c.

[59] An. 58. n. 18. (t. 1. p. 524 d.) At illud, quod ad hæc spectat, in primis dicendum est, conjugatos olim sæpius eligi contigisse; ea tamen lege, ut quantumlibet necessitate cogente ejusmodi assumerentur, consentiente primum uxore, sic electi desinerent prorsus usu conjugii esse viri; atque adeo, ut si inventi essent liberis operam dare, redigerentur in ordinem. Quod ita apostolica traditione receptum usuque probatum erat, ut quantumlibet Jovinianus impurissimus esset, affirmaret tamen hoc ipsum: ad quem Hieronymus: 'Certe,' inquit, 'confiteris, non posse esse episcopum, qui in episcopatu filios faciat; alioquin si deprehensus fuerit, non quasi vir tenebitur, sed quasi adulter damnabitur.' Adeo, inquam, alta radice fixa in ecclesia erat continentia sacerdotum, ut eam convellere ipsi hæretici desperarent: quippe qui non ignorarent, ab Apostolis esse plantatam, ac feliciissime propagatam. Quod patres in Concilio secundo Carthaginensi ingenue sunt professi, testantes id sanctos Apostolos docuisse, et in ecclesia antiquitus ab omnibus esse servatum: sicque interdum ad sacros ordines conjugati adsciscerentur, ut a conjugii usu penitus temperarent.

BOOK III.

OF THE INFERIOR ORDERS OF THE CLERGY IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

CHAP. I.

Of the first original of the inferior orders, and the number and use of them: and how they differed from the superior orders of bishops, presbyters, and deacons.

The inferior orders not of apostolical, but only ecclesiastical institution: proved against Baronius and the Council of Trent.

1. HAVING in the last book discoursed of the superior orders of the clergy in the primitive Church, I come now to treat of those which are commonly called the inferior orders. And here our first inquiry must be concerning the original and number of them. The two great oracles of the Romish Church, Baronius[1] and the Council of Trent[2], are very dogmatical and positive in their assertions both about their rise and number, that they are precisely five, viz. subdeacons, acolythists, exorcists, readers, and door-keepers; and that they are all of apostolical institution. And herein they are followed not only by Bellarmine[3], and the common writers of that side, but also by

[1] An. 44. n. 78. (t. 1. p. 335 b.) Ignatius ejusmodi numerat ecclesiasticos ordines et officia, sic scribens ad Antiochenos: Saluto, inquit, sanctum presbyterorum collegium, saluto sacros diaconos; et paullo post: Saluto hypodiaconos, lectores, cantores, janitores, laborantes, exorcistas, confessores: saluto custodes sacrorum vestibulorum, &c. Hæcque omnia ministeria ex apostolica institutione fluxisse satis demonstrat, dum superius eosdem Antiochenos alloquutus hæc ait: Pauli et Petri fuistis discipuli: ne perdatis depositum. Porro Ignatius inter illa non ordines tantum, sed et officia quædam recensuit ecclesiastica, nempe cantorum et laborantium.

[2] Sess. 23. c. 2. (t. 14. p. 862 d.) .... Et ab ipso ecclesiæ initio, sequentium ordinum nomina, atque uniuscujusque eorum propria ministeria, subdiaconi scilicet, acolythi, exorcistæ, lectoris, et ostiarii, in usu fuisse cognoscuntur.—Conf. Catechism. ad Paroch., De Sacrament. Ordinis, p. 222. (Par. 1671. part. 2. c. 24. p. 275.) Docendum igitur erit, hosce omnes ordines septenario numero contineri, semperque ita a catholica ecclesia traditum esse, quorum nomina hæc sunt, ostiarius, lector, exorcista, acolythus, subdiaconus, diaconus, sacerdos.

[3] De Cler. l. 1. c. 11. De Numero Ordinum Ecclesiasticorum (t. 2. p. 259 c.)

Schelstrate[4], a person who lived in greater light, and might have seen through the mists that were cast before the eyes of others. Cardinal Bona[5] distinguishes between subdeacons and the rest. He fairly owns, 'that acolythists, exorcists, readers, and door-keepers, are not of apostolical institution,' as the modern schoolmen pretend: but as to subdeacons he joins with them entirely, and says[6] 'that though the Scripture makes no express mention of them, yet their institution must be referred either to Christ, or at least to his Apostles.' The French writers are not generally so tenacious of this opinion, as having never sworn to receive the decrees of the Tridentine fathers with an implicit faith; but many of them ingenuously confess the rise of the inferior orders to be owing only to ecclesiastical institution. Morinus[7] undertakes to prove 'that there was no such order as that of acolythists, or exorcists, or door-keepers, among the Greeks in the age next to the Apostles;' nor does Schelstrate disprove his arguments, though he makes a show of

[4] C. Antioch. Restitut. dissert. 4. c. 17. art. 2. (p. 519.) Joannes Morinus, exercitatione 14, acturus de minoribus ordinibus secundum Græcos, capite 1, hunc titulum præfigit: *Demonstratur, ab annis mille supra centum, nullam fuisse apud orientales trium minorum ordinum memoriam. Immo, hoc silentium extendi posse ad tempora Apostolis vicina.* Per tres illos ordines a Græcis sublatos intelligit ostiariorum, exorcistarum, et acolythorum. *Una,* inquit, *est illis ordinatio nempe lectoris, et si quis curiosius agere velit, duas illis tribuet, cantoris nimirum et lectoris jam citati.* Hoc autem ut probet extendi posse ad tempora Apostolis vicina, producit Liturgiam antiquam S. Marco tributam, quæ tres ordines minores omittit: *Memento etiam ubique degentium orthodoxorum episcoporum, presbyterorum, diaconorum, subdiaconorum, lectorum, cantorum, monachorum, viduarum, laicorum.* Canonem item 69 Apostolorum: *Si quis episcopus, aut presbyter, aut diaconus, aut hypodiaconus, aut lector, aut cantor, sanctam quadragesimam non jejunarit, vel quartam, vel parasceuen, deponitor.* Constitutiones Clementis, l. 8. c. 31, afferentes duntaxat gradus presbyterorum, diaconorum, hypodiaconorum, lectorum, aut cantorum, et diaconissarum. Demum S. Ephrem Constantini Magni temporibus, in Sermone Paræenetico de Secundo Domini Adventu: *Tunc clerici ab aliis dividentur clericis, episcopi ab episcopis, diaconi ab aliis diaconis, et subdiaconi, cantores, atque lectores, a se invicem.* Verum miror Joannem Morinum ex hisce testimoniis probare conatum, silentium trium ordinum extendi posse ad tempora Apostolis vicina, &c.

[5] Rer. Liturg. l. 1. c. 25. n. 17. (p. 267.).... Acolythos scilicet, exorcistas, lectores, et ostiarios, quos antiquissimos esse et ab Apostolis, vel ab immediatis eorum successoribus institutos, doctores scholastici asserunt, sed non probant.

[6] Ibid. n. 16. (p. 266.).... Subdiaconorum est, quorum licet expressa mentio in Sacris Literis non reperiatur, eorum tamen institutio vel ad Christum, ut recentiores scholastici existimant, vel ad Apostolos referenda est.

[7] De Ordinat. exercit. 14. c. 1. tot. (pp. 188, seqq.) De minoribus, &c.

refuting him. Duarenus says[8] there were no such orders originally in the first and primitive Church. Cotelerius confesses[9] their original is involved wholly in obscurity; that there is no mention made of any of them in Ignatius, or any other ancient writer before Cyprian and Tertullian. And therefore Habertus[10] is clearly of opinion, 'that it would be more advisable for their Church to expunge all the inferior orders out of the number and catalogue of sacraments, and refer them only to ecclesiastical institution, as the ancient divines were used to do.' By the ancient divines he means the schoolmen, who were generally of this opinion heretofore. For Peter Lombard, who is set at the head of them, declares[11] 'that the primitive Church had no orders below those of presbyters and deacons; nor did the Apostle give command about any other; but the Church in succeeding ages instituted subdeacons and acolythists herself.' And this is the opinion of Aquinas[12], and Amalarius Fortunatus[13], and many others. Schelstrate him-

[8] De Minist. et Benefic. l. 1. c. 14. (fol. 17. vers.) In veteri ecclesia non erat hæc munerum distinctio, quæ postea in usum venit, ut alii ostiarii dicerentur, alii lectores, exorcistæ, aut acolythi; sed diaconorum, hypodiaconorumque muneri conjuncta erant hæc omnia.

[9] Not. in Constit. Apost. l. 2. c. 25. (v. 1. p. 238. n. 75.) Quæ post Apostolos tempore minores ordines, diaconatu inferiores, cœperint in ecclesia institui, adeo obscuritate involvitur, ut nulla possit certa conjectura deprehendi atque explicari.

[10] Archierat. part. 5. observ. 1. (p. 48.) Consultius est meo quidem judicio, ordines hierarchicis inferiores, ipsumque adeo hypodiaconi, et a sacramentorum censu expungere, et ad institutionem duntaxat ecclesiasticam cum antiquis theologis referre.

[11] Sentent. l. 4. dist. 24. p. 348. (p. 388.).... Hos solos primitiva ecclesia legitur habuisse, et de his solis præceptum Apostoli habemus..... Subdiaconos vero et acolythos, procedente tempore, ecclesia sibi constituit.

[12] Supplem. part. 3. quæst. 37. art. 2. respons. ad secundum. (t. 25. p. 103.).... In primitiva ecclesia, propter paucitatem ministrorum, omnia inferiora ministeria diaconis committebantur, ut patet per Dionysium, c. 3. Eccles. Hierarch..... ubi dicit: *Ministrorum alii stant ad portas clausas; alii aliud proprii ordinis operantur; alii autem sacerdotibus proponunt super altare sacrum panem et benedictionis calicem.* Nihilominus erant omnes prædictæ potestates, sed implicite, in una diaconi potestate. Sed postea ampliatus est cultus divinus; et ecclesia quod implicite habebat in uno ordine, explicite tradidit in diversis.

[13] De Offic. Eccles. l. 2. c. 6. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 14. p. 971 a.) Primo, notandum est, eos ordines, qui potissimum necessarii sunt in ecclesia, Apostolum Paulum denominasse et eorum mores depinxisse, sine quibus non potest rite immolatio altaris celebrari, scilicet, sine sacerdote et diacono. Ut sine retractatione sacerdos vigilet circa hostias, necessarius est diaconus ad ministranda ea quæ necessaria sunt sacerdoti: cæteri ordines his adjecti sunt.... Crescente ecclesia, crevit officium ecclesiasticum: ut multitudini ecclesiæ subveniri posset, adji-

self owns[14] that it was the opinion of two popes, Urban the Second and Innocent the Third, that the order of subdeacons was not reckoned among the sacred orders of the primitive Church. It was indeed an inferior order in the third century, but not dignified with the title of a sacred or superior order till the twelfth age of the Church; when, as Menardus informs us out of a MS. book of Petrus Cantor[15], a writer of that age, it was then but just newly dignified with that character; that is, in an age when bishops and presbyters began to be reckoned but one order, in compliance with an hypothesis peculiar to the Romish Church, then the order of subdeacons stepped up to be a superior order. And whereas the primitive Church was used to reckon the three superior orders to be those of bishops, presbyters, and deacons, the Romish Church now began to speak in a different style, and count the three superior orders those of priests, deacons, and subdeacons: so that this last became a superior order, which for some ages before had been only an inferior order, and at first was no order at all. For the testimonies alleged by Schelstrate, after Bellarmine and Baronius, to prove the inferior orders of apostolical institution, are of no authority or weight in this case. The Epistle under the name of Ignatius ad Antiochenos, and the Constitutions under the name of Clemens Romanus, which are the only authorities pretended in this matter, are now vulgarly known to be none of their genuine writings, but the works of some authors of much later date. So that till some better proofs

ciuntur inferiores in adjutorio præpositorum.

[14] C. Antioch. Restitut. dissert. 4. c. 17. art. 1. n. 4. (p. 514.) Scio ... Urbanum secundum in synodo Beneventana apud Ivonem in Decreto, part. 5. c. 72, statuisse: *Nullus in episcopatum eligatur, nisi in sacris ordinibus religiose vivens inventus est: sacros autem ordines dicimus diaconatus, presbyteratus. Hos siquidem solos primitiva ecclesia legitur habuisse: super his solis præceptum Apostoli habemus. Subdiaconi vero, quia et ipsi altaribus administrant, opportunitate exigente concedimus sed rarissime, si tamen spectatæ sint religionis et scientiæ, &c.* Et Innocentium tertium hæc ita interpretatum fuisse in Epistola ad Mutinensem episcopum relata per Gregorium Papam IX., l. 1. decret. tit. 14. c. 9, *Quod Urbanus ad statum primitivæ ecclesiæ se referens (in quo subdiaconatus ordo sacer minime dicebatur) instituit, ut de subdiacono (nisi utilitatis causa, &c.) non posset electio celebrari.* Et ipsum Innocentium addidisse: *Ut subdiaconus in episcopum valeat libere eligi, sicut diaconus vel sacerdos, &c.*

[15] De Verb. Mirific. ap. Menard. Not. in Sacrament. Greg. p. 280. (Oper. Greg. M. t. 3. part. 1. p. 494 d. 9.).... Prima manus impositio debetur diaconibus ordinandis: de novo enim institutum est, subdiaconatum esse sacrum ordinem.

be given, there will be reason to conclude that these inferior orders were not of apostolical, but only of ecclesiastical institution.

No certain number of them in the primitive Church.

2. And this may be argued further, not only from the silence of the most ancient writers, but also from the accounts of those who speak of them presently after their institution. For though the Romish Church determines them to be precisely five in number, yet in the ancient Church there was no such rule; but some accounts speak of more than five, and others not of so many: which argues that they were not of apostolical institution. The author under the name of Ignatius[16] reckons six without acolythists, viz. subdeacons, readers, singers, doorkeepers, copiatæ, and exorcists. The author of the Constitutions under the name of Clemens Romanus[17] counts but four of these orders, viz. subdeacons, readers, singers, and doorkeepers: for he makes no mention of the copiatæ, or of acolythists; and though he speaks of exorcists, yet he says[18] expressly it was no Church-order. The Apostolical Canons[19], as they are commonly called, name only three, subdeacons, readers, and singers. And though the author under the name of St. Jerom[20] mentions four, yet he brings the *copiatæ* or *fossarii* into the account, and makes them the first order of the clergy, leaving out acolythists and exorcists. Epiphanius makes no mention of acolythists[21], but instead of them puts in the copiatæ and interpreters. Others add the *parabolani* also; and, except Cornelius[22], there is scarce any other ancient

[16] Ep. ad Antioch. n. 12. (Cotel. v. 2. p. 112.) ... Ἀσπάζομαι ὑποδιακόνους, ἀναγνώστας, ψάλτας, πυλωροὺς, τοὺς κοπιῶντας, ἐπορκιστάς· κ. τ. λ.

[17] L. 3. c. 11. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 284.) Ἀλλ' οὔτε τοῖς λοιποῖς κληρικοῖς ἐπιτρέπομεν βαπτίζειν· οἷον ἀναγνώσταις, ἢ ψάλταις, ἢ πυλωροῖς, ἢ ὑπηρέταις· ἢ μόνοις ἐπισκόποις, καὶ πρεσβυτέροις, ἐξυπηρετουμένων αὐτοῖς τῶν διακόνων.

[18] Ibid. l. 8. c. 26. (p. 410.) Ὁ αὐτὸς περὶ ἐπορκιστοῦ διατάσσομαι· ἐπορκιστὴς οὐ χειροτονεῖται.

[19] C. 68. [al. 69.] (Cotel. [c. 61.] ibid. p. 446.) Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος, [ἢ ὑποδιάκονος,] ἢ ἀναγνώστης, ἢ ψάλτης, τὴν ἁγίαν τεσσαρακοστὴν [τοῦ πάσχα] οὐ νηστεύει, ἢ τετράδα, ἢ παρασκευὴν, [οὐ νηστεύοι,] καθαιρείσθω.

[20] De Sept. Ord. Eccles. t. 4. p. 81. (t. 11. p. 116 e.) Primus igitur in clericis fossariorum ordo est, &c.

[21] Expos. Fid. n. 21. (t. 1. p. 1104 b, c.) Εἶθ' ἑξῆς τούτων, ἐπορκισταὶ, καὶ ἑρμηνευταὶ γλώσσης εἰς γλῶσσαν, ἢ ἐν ταῖς ἀναγνώσεσιν, ἢ ἐν ταῖς προσομιλίαις· λοιπὸν δὲ καὶ κοπιαταὶ, οἱ τὰ σώματα περιστέλλοντες τῶν κοιμωμένων· καὶ θυρωροὶ, καὶ ἡ πᾶσα εὐταξία.

[22] Ep. ad Fab. ap. Euseb. l. 6. c. 43. (t. 1. p. 312. 8.) .... Ἐν ᾗ οὐκ ἠγνόει· πῶς γάρ; πρεσβυτέρους εἶναι τεσσαράκοντα ἓξ· διακόνους ἑπτὰ, ὑποδιακόνους ἑπτὰ, ἀκολούθους δύο

writer who is so precise to the number of five inferior orders, as now computed in the Church of Rome.

Not instituted in all Churches at the same time.

3. The reason of which difference must needs be this, that there was no certain rule left originally about any such orders; but every Church instituted them for herself, at such times and in such numbers as her own necessities seemed to require. For at first most of the offices of these inferior orders were performed by the deacons, as I have had occasion to shew in another place[23]. But as the number of converts increased in large Churches, such as that of Rome, which confined herself to the number of seven deacons, the duties of the deacon's office quickly became too great and heavy for them; whereupon a sort of assistants to them were appointed, first in those great Churches, under the names of these inferior orders, to take off from the deacons some of the heavy burden that lay upon them. And that is the reason why we meet with the inferior orders in such great and populous Churches as Rome and Carthage in the beginning of the third century; whereas in many of the lesser Churches all the offices were still performed by deacons, even in the fourth and fifth centuries: which may be concluded from the words of the author under the name of St. Austin, where, speaking of the deacons of Rome, he says[24], 'the reason why they did not perform all the inferior services of the Church was, that there was a multitude of the lesser clergy under them; whereas otherwise they must have taken care of the altar and its utensils, &c., as it was in other Churches at that time;' which seems evidently to imply, that these inferior orders were not taken into all Churches when that author made this observation.

The principal use of them in the primitive Church, to be a sort of nursery for the hierarchy.

4. But such Churches as admitted them made them subservient to divers good ends and purposes; for, besides that of relieving the deacons in some part of their office, they were also a sort of *nursery for the sacred hierarchy*, or superior orders of the Church. For in those days such Churches as had these orders settled in them commonly chose their superior

καὶ τεσσαράκοντα; ἐξορκιστὰς δὲ καὶ ἀναγνώστας ἅμα πυλωροῖς δύο καὶ πεντήκοντα, κ. τ. λ.

[23] B. 2. ch. 20. s. 15. p. 266.

[24] Quæst. Vet. et Nov. Test. 101. t. 4. (t. 3. p. 92 f.) Ut autem non omnia ministeria obsequiorum per ordinem agant, multitudo facit clericorum. Nam utique et altare portarent, et vasa ejus, et aquam in manus funderent sacerdoti, sicut videmus per omnes ecclesias.

ministers, bishops, presbyters, and deacons, out of them; and the clergy of these lesser orders were a sort of candidates under trial and probation for the greater. For the Church, not having the advantage of Christian academies at that time, took this method to train up fit persons for the ministry; first exercising them in some of the lower offices, that they might be the better disciplined and qualified for the duties of the superior functions. And by this means every bishop knew perfectly both the abilities and morals of all the clergy of his diocese; for they were bred up under his eye, and governed by his care and inspection. In some places they lived all in one house, and eat all at one table; as Possidius[25] particularly notes of St. Austin's Church at Hippo, and Sozomen[26] of the Church of Rinocurura, in the confines of Palestine and Egypt, 'that they had house and table, and every thing in common.' Hence it became a custom in Spain, in the time of the Gothic kings, about the end of the fifth century, for parents to dedicate their children very young to the service of the Church; in which case they were taken into the bishop's family, and educated under him by some discreet and grave presbyter, whom the bishop deputed for that purpose, and set over them, by the name of *præpositus*, and *magister disciplinæ*, *the superintendent*, or *master of discipline*, because his chief business was to inspect their behaviour, and instruct them in the rules and discipline of the Church; as we may see in the second and fourth Councils of Toledo[27], which give directions about this affair.

5. And upon this account these inferior clergy were tied, as well as others, to the perpetual service of the Church, when **Not allowed to forsake their ser-**

[25] Vit. August. c. 25. (tom. 10. append. p. 274 f.) Cum ipso semper clerici, una etiam domo ac mensa, sumptibusque communibus alebantur et vestiebantur.

[26] L. 6. c. 31. (v. 2. p. 266. 11.) .... Κοινὴ δέ ἐστι τοῖς αὐτόθι κληρικοῖς οἴκησίς τε καὶ τράπεζα καὶ τ' ἄλλα πάντα.

[27] Tolet. 2. c. 1. (t. 4. p. 1733 [corrige, 1735.] a.) De his quos voluntas parentum a primis infantiæ annis [in] clericatus officio [vel monachali posuit] [manciparit] statuimus.... ut in domo ecclesiæ sub episcopali præsentia a præposito sibi debeant erudiri.—Tolet. 4. c. 23. [al. 24.] (t. 5. p. 1713 c.) Si qui in clero puberes aut adolescentes existunt, omnes in uno conclavi atrii commorentur, ut [lubricæ ætatis annos non in luxuria, sed] in disciplinis ecclesiasticis agant, deputato probatissimo seniore, quem et magistrum disciplinæ et testem vitæ habeant. [Labbe reads,—Deputati probatissimo seniori, quem magistrum doctrinæ, &c. Ed.]

vice, and return to a mere secular life again.

once they had devoted and dedicated themselves to it. They might not then forsake their station, and return to a mere secular life again at their own pleasure. The Council of Chalcedon has a peremptory canon[28] to this purpose: 'that if any person ordained among the clergy betake himself to any military or civil employment, and does not repent and return to the office he had first chosen for God's sake, he should be anathematized;' which is repeated in the Councils of Tours[29], and Tribur[30], and some others, where it is interpreted so as to include the inferior orders as well as the superior.

How they differed from the superior orders in name, in office, and in manner of ordination.

6. But though they agreed in this, yet in other respects they differed very much from one another. As, first, in name: The clergy of the superior orders are commonly called the ἱερώμενοι, *holy*, and *sacred*, as in Socrates[31] and others; whence the name *hierarchy* is used by the author under the name of Dionysius the Areopagite[32] to signify peculiarly the orders of bishops, presbyters, and deacons; as Hallier, a famous Sorbonne doctor, has abundantly proved against Cellotius the Jesuit in his learned and elaborate Defence[33] of the Hierarchy of the Church. But, on the other hand, the inferior orders in the ancient canons have only the name of *insacrati*,

[28] C. 7. (t. 4. p. 759 a.) Τοὺς ἅπαξ ἐν κλήρῳ τεταγμένους [κατειλεγμένους] . . ὡρίσαμεν, μήτε ἐπὶ στρατείαν, μήτε ἐπὶ ἀξίαν κοσμικὴν ἔρχεσθαι· ἢ τοῦτο τολμῶντας, καὶ μὴ μεταμελουμένους, ὥστε ἐπιστρέψαι ἐπὶ τοῦτο, ὃ διὰ Θεὸν πρότερον εἵλοντο, ἀναθεματίζεσθαι.

[29] Turonens. 1. c. 5. [ibid. p. 1051 d.) Si quis vero clericus, relicto officii sui ordine, laicam voluerit agere vitam, vel se militiæ tradiderit, excommunicationis pœna feriatur.

[30] C. 27. (t. 9. p. 454 d.) In synodo Chalcedonensi, capite septimo, statutum est, ut clerici qui semel in clero deputati sunt, neque ad militiam, neque ad aliquam veniant dignitatem mundanam . . . Nos autem eamdem sequentes canonicam autoritatem statuimus, ut clericus, &c.

[31] L. 1. c. 11. (v. 2. p. 38. 42.) Ὁ δὲ πρὸς λυσιτελείαν τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ κόσμον τῶν ἱερωμένων διὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ συμβουλὴν γέγονε, τοῦτο διηγήσομαι.—L. 1. c. 15. (p. 44. 24.) Τοῦτόν φησιν ὁ Ῥουφῖνος κομιδῇ νήπιον ὄντα, παίζειν σὺν ἑτέροις ἡλικιώταις ἱερὸν παίγνιον· τοῦτο δὲ ἦν μίμησις ἱεροσύνης καὶ τοῦ καταλόγου τῶν ἱερωμένων ἀνδρῶν.

[32] Hierarch. Eccles. c. 5. n. 2. (t. 1. p. 230 b.) Ἡ μὲν ἁγιωτάτη τῶν ὑπερουρανίων οὐσίων ἱεραρχία, κ. τ. λ.

[33] De Hierarch. Eccles. l. 1. de Hierarchiæ Nomine, &c. c. 3. art. 1. (p. 50.) Primo quidem stricte, &c. —[Conf. ibid. art. 2. (p. 54.) In quem locum [Joelis 1.] Cyrillus, &c. Ed.] — L. 3. de Ordinibus Hierarchicis, &c. s. 2. c. 1. (pp. 230, seqq.) *Episcopalem, presbyteralem, et diaconalem veros ordines hierarchicos esse.*—Ibid. c. 2. (pp. 240, seqq.) *Solos istos ordines episcoporum, presbyterorum, diaconorum, non cæterorum inferiorum, hierarchicos esse.*

unconsecrated; as in the Council of Agde[34], where the *insacrati ministri* are forbidden to touch the sacred vessels, or to enter into the *diaconicon* or *sanctuary*, it is plain there must be meant the inferior orders. 2. Another difference, which gave rise to the former distinction, was the different ceremonies observed in the manner of their ordination. The one were always ordained at the altar; the others not so: the one with the solemn rite of imposition of hands; the other commonly without it. Whence St. Basil[35] calls the one *βαθμὸς, a degree;* but the other *ἀχειροτόνητος ὑπηρεσία, an inferior ministry which had no imposition of hands.* 3. The main difference was in the exercise of their office and function. The one were ordained to minister before God as priests, to celebrate his sacraments, to expound his word publicly in the church, &c. In which respects the three superior orders of bishops, presbyters, and deacons, are said by Optatus and others to have each their share and degree in the Christian priesthood, as has been noted in the former book[36]: but the inferior orders were not appointed to any such ministry, but only to attend the ministers in divine service, and perform some lower and ordinary offices, which any Christian, by the bishop's appointment, was qualified to perform. What these offices were, shall be shewed by a particular account of them in the following chapters.

CHAP. II.

Of subdeacons.

No mention of subdeacons till the third century.

1. The first notice we have of this order in any ancient writers is in the middle of the third century, when Cyprian and Cornelius lived, who both speak of subdeacons as settled in the Church in their time. Cyprian[37] mentions them at least ten times in his Epistles; and Cornelius, in his famous

[34] C. 66. (t. 4. p. 1394 a.) ... ...Non licet [al. oportet] insacratos ministros licentiam habere, in secretarium, quod Græci diaconicon appellant, ingredi, et contingere vasa dominica.

[35] Ep. Canon. c. 51. (CC. t. 2. p. 1745 e.) Τὸ κατὰ τοὺς κληρικοὺς ἀδιαφορίστως οἱ κανόνες ἐξέθεντο, κελεύσαντες μίαν ἐπὶ τοῖς παραπεσοῦσιν ὁρίζεσθαι τιμωρίαν, τὴν ἔκπτωσιν τῆς ὑπηρεσίας, εἴτε ἐν βαθμῷ τυγχάνοιεν, εἴτε καὶ ἀχειροτονήτῳ [al. ἀχειροθέτῳ] ὑπηρεσίᾳ προσκαρτεροῖεν.

[36] B. 2. c. 19. s. 15. p. 235.

[37] Ep. 8. 20. 29. 34. 35. 45. 78. 79. Ed. Oxon. (Ep. 11. 25. 35. 39. 40. 48. 77. 78. Ed. Amstel. 1700.)

Epistle to Fabius[38], bishop of Antioch, where he gives a catalogue of the clergy then belonging to the Church of Rome, reckons seven subdeacons among them. But some think they were not quite so early in the Greek Church; for Habertus says[39] no Greek writer speaks of them before Athanasius[40], who lived in the fourth century.

2. The author of the Constitutions indeed refers them to an apostolical original; and in compliance with that hypothesis, brings in Thomas the Apostle giving direction to bishops to ordain them with imposition[41] of hands and prayer, as he does for all the rest of the inferior orders. But that author is singular in this; for it does not appear to have been the practice of the Greek Church, whose customs he chiefly represents. St. Basil, a more credible witness, says of this and all the other inferior orders, that they were[42] ἀχειροτόνητοι, *ordained without imposition of hands.* And, for the Latin Church, it is evident from a canon of the fourth Council of Carthage, where we have the form and manner of their ordination thus expressed[43]: 'When a subdeacon is ordained, seeing he has no imposition of hands, let him receive an empty patin and an empty cup from the hands of the bishop, and an ewer and towel from the archdeacon.' Which form, wholly excluding imposition of hands, is a good collateral evidence (as Habertus[44] confesses ingenuously) to prove that this order was not instituted by the Apostles; for they did not use to omit this ceremony in any of their ordinations.

[38] Ap. Euseb. l. 6. c. 43. See ch. 1. s. 2. p. 305. n. 22.

[39] Archierat. part. 1. observ. 1. (p. 49.) Apud Græcos serius auditum hypodiaconi nomen.... Apud S. Anastasium primum legi, Epistola ad Solitarios, ubi Ariani ἥρπασαν Εὐτύχιον ὑποδιάκονον ἄνδρα καλῶς ὑπηρετοῦντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ· ὑπηρετεῖν enim hypodiaconorum proprium.

[40] Ad Solitar. Vit. Agent. (t. 1. part. 1. p. 300 c. n. 60.) See the preceding note.

[41] L. 8. c. 21. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 408.) Περὶ τῶν ὑποδιακόνων ἐγὼ Θωμᾶς διατάσσομαι ὑμῖν τοῖς ἐπισκόποις· ὑποδιάκονον χειροτονῶν, ὦ ἐπίσκοπε, ἐπιθήσεις ἐπ' αὐτῷ τὰς χεῖρας, καὶ ἐρεῖς· Δέσποτα Θεέ, κ. τ. λ.

[42] Ep. Canon. c. 51. See ch. 1. s. 6. n. 35, preceding.

[43] C. 5. (t. 2. p. 1200 a.) Subdiaconus cum ordinatur, quia manus impositionem non accipit, patinam de episcopi manu accipiat vacuam, et calicem vacuum. De manu vero archidiaconi urceolum cum aqua, et mantile, et manutergium.

[44] Archierat. part. 5. observ. 1. (p. 48.) Quin istud eo mihi probabilius, quo apud Latinos hypodiacono manus haudquaquam imponatur, quam tamen ceremoniam divinæ institutionis et apostolici temporis ordinatio procul dubio requireret.

3. As to the office of subdeacons, we may in some measure learn what it was from the forementioned canon, viz. 'that it was to fit and prepare the sacred vessels and utensils of the altar, and deliver them to the deacon in time of divine service.' But they were not allowed to minister as deacons at the altar; no, nor so much as to come within the rails of it to set a patin, or cup, or the oblations of the people thereon; as appears from a canon of the Council of Laodicea[45], which forbids the ὑπηρέται, by which is meant *subdeacons*, to have any place within the *diaconicon* or *sanctuary*, or to touch the holy vessels, meaning at the communion-table. Though this is now their office in the Church of Rome; and in that Bona[46] owns they differ from those of the ancient Church. Another of their offices was to attend the doors of the church during the communion-service. This is mentioned by the Council of Laodicea, in a canon[47] which fixes them to that station. And Valesius thinks Eusebius meant them, when, describing the temple of Paulinus, he speaks[48] of some, whose office it was θυραυλεῖν καὶ ποδηγεῖν τοὺς εἰσιόντας, *to attend the doors, and conduct those that came in to their proper places.* The author of the Constitutions[49] divides this office between the deacons and subdeacons, ordering the deacons to stand at the men's gate, and the subdeacons at the women's, that no one might go forth, nor the doors be opened in the time of the oblation. Besides these offices in the church, they had another office out of the church, which was to go on the bishop's embassies with his letters or messages to foreign Churches. For in those days, by reason of the persecutions, a bishop did not so much as send a letter to a foreign Church but by the hands of one of his

A brief account of their office.

[45] C. 21. (t. 1. p. 1500 e.) Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ὑπηρέτας ἔχειν χώραν ἐν τῷ διακονικῷ, καὶ ἁπτεσθαι δεσποτικῶν σκευῶν.

[46] Rer. Liturg. l. 1. c. 25. n. 16. (p. 266.) Olim nec calicem, nec patinam, nec oblationes in altari ponebant, sed hæc omnia porrigebant diaconis, eisque serviebant intra sanctuarium.

[47] C. 22. (t. 1. p. 1500 e.) Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ὑπηρέτην ὡράριον φορεῖν, οὐδὲ τὰς θύρας ἐγκαταλιμπάνειν.

[48] L. 10. c. 4. (v. 1. p. 478. 16.) ...Οἷς δὲ τὰς ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον ἐπιτρέπων εἰσόδους· θυραυλεῖν καὶ ποδηγεῖν τοὺς εἰσιόντας κατατάττων.—[Vales. in h.l. (ibid. n. 1.) Intelligit Eusebius hypodiaconos, qui portas ecclesiæ servabant, et intrantes singulos ad sua loca deducebant. *Grischov.*]

[49] L. 8. c. 11. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 398.) Οἱ δὲ διάκονοι ἱστάσθωσαν εἰς τὰς τῶν ἀνδρῶν θύρας, καὶ οἱ ὑποδιάκονοι εἰς τὰς τῶν γυναικῶν, ὅπως μήτις ἐξέλθοι· μήτε ἀνοιχθῇ ἡ θύρα, κἂν πιστός τις ᾖ, κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἀναφορᾶς.

clergy; whence Cyprian[50] gives such letters the name of *literæ clericæ;* and the subdeacons were the men that were commonly employed in this office: as appears from every one of those Epistles in Cyprian which speak of subdeacons; particularly in that which he wrote to the clergy of Carthage in his retirement, where he tells them[51], 'that having occasion to write to the Church of Rome, and needing some of the clergy to convey his letter by, he was obliged to ordain a new subdeacon for this purpose, because the Church could not spare him one at that time, having scarce enough left to perform her own daily services.' These were anciently the chief of the subdeacons' offices at their first institution.

4. And great care was taken that they should not exceed their bounds, or encroach too much upon the deacon's office. They might not take upon them to minister the bread or the cup to the people at the Lord's table[52]; they might not bid the prayers, nor do any part of that service which the deacons did, as they were the *κήρυκες*, or holy *criers* of the Church. This is the meaning of the canon of the Council of Laodicea[53], which prohibits the subdeacons from wearing an *orarium* in the time of divine service; which was an habit of deacons that they made use of as a signal to give notice of the prayers, and other services of the Church, to the catechumens, penitents, &c., who were to observe their directions: this habit therefore the subdeacons might not wear, because it was a distinguishing habit of a superior order. And further, to shew the same subjection and deference to deacons, as deacons did to presbyters, they are forbidden by another canon[54] of that Council to sit in the presence of a deacon without his leave.

[50] Ep. 4. [al. 9.] (p. 182.)...Perquam etenim grave est si epistolæ clericæ veritas mendacio aliquo et fraude corrupta est.

[51] Ep. 24. [al. 29.] (p. 208.] Et quoniam oportuit me per clericos scribere; scio autem nostros plurimos absentes esse, paucos vero, qui illic sunt, vix ad ministerium quotidiani operis sufficere; necesse fuit novos aliquos constituere, qui mitterentur. Fecisse me autem sciatis lectorem Saturum, et hypodiaconum Optatum confessorem.

[52] Vid. C. Laod. c. 25. (t. 1. p. 1501 a.)..Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ὑπηρέτας ἄρτον διδόναι, οὐδὲ ποτήριον εὐλογεῖν.

[53] C. 22. See s. 3. n. 47, preceding.

[54] C. 20. (t. 1. p. 1500 d.) Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ διάκονον ἔμπροσθεν πρεσβυτέρου καθέζεσθαι, ἀλλὰ μετὰ κελεύσεως τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου καθέζεσθαι· ὁμοίως δὲ ἔχειν τιμὴν καὶ τοὺς διακόνους ὑπὸ τῶν ὑπηρετῶν, καὶ πάντων τῶν κληρικῶν.

5. There is but one thing more I shall note concerning this order, which is the singularity of the Church of Rome in keeping to the number of seven subdeacons. For in the Epistle of Cornelius[55], which gives us the catalogue of the Romish clergy, we find but seven deacons and seven subdeacons, though there were forty-four presbyters and forty-two acolythists, and of exorcists, readers, and door-keepers, no less than fifty-two. But other Churches did not tie themselves to follow this example; for in the great Church of Constantinople, and three lesser that belonged to it, there were ninety subdeacons, as may be seen in one of Justinian's Novels[56], where he gives a catalogue of the clergy, and fixes the number of every order, amounting to above five hundred in the whole.

The singularity of the Church of Rome in keeping to the precise number of seven subdeacons.

CHAP. III.

Of acolythists.

1. Next to the subdeacons the Latin writers commonly put acolythists, which was an order peculiar to the Latin Church; for there was no such order in the Greek Church for above four hundred years; nor is it ever so much as mentioned among the orders of the Church by any Greek writer all that time, as Cabassutius[57] and Schelstrate[58] confess. And though it occurs sometimes in the latter Greek Rituals, yet Schelstrate says it is there only another name for the order of subdeacons. But in the Latin Church these two were distinguished; for Cornelius in his catalogue makes a plain difference between them, in saying there were forty-two acolythists and but seven subdeacons in the Church of Rome. Cyprian also speaks of them frequently in his Epistles[59] as distinct from the order of subdeacons; though wherein their offices differed is not very easy to determine from either of those authors.

Acolythists an order peculiar to the Latin Church, and never mentioned by any Greek writers for four centuries.

[55] Ap. Euseb. l. 6. c. 43. See ch. 1. s. 2. p. 305. n. 22.

[56] Novel. 3. c. 1. See before, b. 2. ch. 20. s. 19. p. 270. n. 43.

[57] Notit. Concil. c. 42. p. 249. [al. Dissert. 9. de Ord. Eccles. Numero, &c. s. 3.] (p. 36.) Acolythorum apud Græcos, etsi vox ipsa Græca sit, vel nulla mentio, vel saltem ambigua, &c.

[58] C. Antioch. Restitut. dissert. 4. c. 17. art. 2. n. 7. (p. 526.).... Mirum profecto si Joannes VIII, in laudata superius epistola, per acolythos intellexisset ordinem acolythorum, qui apud Græcos non exstabat, etc.

[59] Ep. 7. 34. 52. 59. 77. 78. 79. Ed. Oxon. (Ep. 13. 39. 55. 64. 76. 77. 78. Ed. Amstel. 1700.)

2. But in the fourth Council of Carthage there is a canon, which gives a little light in the matter; for there we have the form of their ordination, and some intimation of their office also. The canon is to this effect[60]: 'When any acolythist is ordained, the bishop shall inform him how he is to behave himself in his office, and he shall receive a candlestick with a taper in it from the archdeacon, that he may understand that he is appointed to light the candles of the church. He shall also receive an empty pitcher, to furnish wine for the eucharist of the blood of Christ.' So that the acolythist's office seems at that time to have consisted chiefly in these two things; lighting the candles of the church, and attending the ministers with wine for the eucharist; the designation to which office needed no imposition of hands, but only the bishop's appointment, as is plain from the words of the canon now cited.

3. Some[61] think they had another office, which was to accompany and attend the bishop whithersoever he went, and that they were called acolythists upon this account; or perhaps because they were obliged to attend at funerals in the company of the *canonicæ* and *ascetriæ*, with whom they are joined in one of Justinian's Novels[62]. The original word, ἀκόλουθος, as Hesychius[63] explains it, signifies *a young servant*, or *an attendant* who waits continually upon another; and the name seems to be given them from this. But the inference which a learned person[64] makes from hence, that the order of acolythists was first in the Greek Church, because the name is of Greek original, seems not to be so certain; because it can

[60] C. 6. (t. 2. p. 1200 b.) Acolythus cum ordinatur, ab episcopo quidem doceatur qualiter in officio suo agere debeat: sed ab archidiacono accipiat ceroferarium cum cereo, ut sciat se ad accendenda ecclesiæ luminaria mancipari. Accipiat et urceolum vacuum ad suggerendum vinum in eucharistiam sanguinis Christi.

[61] Duarenus, de Minist. et Benefic. l. 1. c. 14. (fol. 18. im.) Quartus gradus est eorum, qui acoluthi Græce dicebantur.... ideo fortassis, quia episcopum comitabantur, quocumque proficisci vellet.

[62] Novel. 59. c. 2. (t. 5. p. 301.) Distributio fiat et decanis, et ascetriis, et canonicis, [et acolythis,] &c.... Decanis, et acolythis, et ascetriis, et canonicis, &c.

[63] (Ad calc. Ed. Basil. 1521.) Ἀκόλουθος, ὁ νεώτερος παῖς, θεράπων, ὁ περὶ τὸ σῶμα.

[64] Fell, Not. in Cypr. Ep. 7. [al. 36.] (p. 178. n. 4.) Munus erat, [nempe, acoluthorum] si quod aliud, per totam ecclesiam hoc sæculo receptissimum. Quod Orientales attinet, nomen a Græcis haustum ostendit apud illos in usu fuisse. De Romana ecclesia literæ Cornelii [see ch. 1. s. 2. p. 305. n. 22.] ad Fabium Antiochienseem.... id abunde testantur.

hardly be imagined that it should be an order of the Greek Church, and yet no writer before Justinian's time make any mention of it.

Whether acolythists be the same with the *deputati* and *ceroferarii* of later ages.

4. I know indeed St. Jerom says[65] 'it was a custom in the Oriental Churches to set up lighted tapers when the Gospel was read, as a token and demonstration of their joy;' but he does not so much as once intimate that they had a peculiar order of acolythists for this purpose, nor does it appear that this was any part of their office in the Latin Church. For that which the Council of Carthage speaks of is probably no more than lighting the candles at night, when the Church was to meet for their *lucernalis oratio*, or *evening prayer*. This office of acolythists, as much as the Romanists contend for the apostolical institution of it, is now no longer in being in the Church of Rome, but changed into that of the *ceroferarii*, or *taper-bearers*, whose office is only to walk before the deacons, &c., with a lighted taper in their hands: which is so different from the office of the ancient acolythists, that Duarenus[66] cannot but express his wonder how the one came to be changed into the other, and why their doctors should call him an acolythist of the ancient Church, who is no more than a taper-bearer of the present. Cardinal Bona[67] carries the reflection a little further, and with some resentment complains, that the inferior orders of the Romish Church bear no resemblance to

[65] Cont. Vigilant. t. 2. p. 123. (t. 2. p. 394 d.) Absque martyrum reliquiis per totas Orientis ecclesias, quando legendum est evangelium, accenduntur lumina, &c.

[66] De Minist. et Benefic. l. 1. c. 14. (fol. 17. vers.) Sed nescio quomodo tandem factum est, ut hoc munus in luminariorum curam postea conversum sit, et doctores nostri passim acolythos ceroferarios interpretentur.

[67] Rer. Liturg. l. 1. c. 25. n. 18. (p. 268.) Abiit nunc in desuetudinem hæc distinctio, quæ diaconos, subdiaconos, et acolythos tantum comprehendebat. Desierunt quoque minorum ordinum officia, quæ plerumque a pueris, et ab hominibus mercede conductis, nullisque ordinibus initiatis, exercentur. Priscis temporibus nemo clericus ordinabatur, qui alicui ecclesiæ non esset addictus. Admissi autem pueri in consortium cleri primo literas, cantum, et ritus ecclesiasticos edoceri solebant; ut passim legimus in Vitis Pontificum: tum ostiarii, deinde lectores ordinabantur, et sic per gradus ad reliquos ordines adscendebant, cum prius singulorum officia exercuissent. Atque hinc oriebatur, ut rerum ecclesiasticarum peritissimi essent, in quibus fuerant ab ipsa pene infantia enutriti. Collabi cœpit hæc disciplina ante annos circiter quingentos, donec paullatim ad illos mores deventum est, quibus nunc utimur et vivimus.

those of the primitive Church, and that for five hundred years the ancient discipline has been lost.

CHAP. IV.

Of exorcists.

Exorcists at first no peculiar order of the clergy.

1. THERE is nothing more certain than that in the apostolical age, and the next following, the power of exorcising, or casting out devils, was a miraculous gift of the Holy Ghost, not confined to the clergy, much less to any single order among them, but given to other Christians also: as many other extraordinary spiritual gifts then were. Origen says[68] private Christians (that is, laymen) did, by their prayers and adjurations, dispossess devils. And Socrates[69] observes particularly of Gregory Thaumaturgus, 'that whilst he was a layman he wrought many miracles, healing the sick, and casting out devils, by sending letters to the possessed party only.' And that this power was common to all orders of Christians, appears further from the challenges of the ancient apologists, Tertullian[70] and others, to the heathens, wherein they undertake, that if they would bring any person possessed with a devil into open court before the magistrate, any ordinary Christian should make him confess that he was a devil and not a god. Minucius[71] speaks of this power among Christians, but he does not ascribe it to any particular order of men: as neither does Justin Martyr[72], nor Irenæus[73], nor Cyprian[74], nor Arno-

[68] Cont. Cels. l. 7. p. 324. (t. 1. p. 596 d.).... *Οὓς οὐκ ὀλίγοι Χριστιανῶν ἀπελαύνουσι τῶν πασχόντων, σὺν οὐδενὶ περιέργῳ καὶ μαγικῷ ἢ φαρμακευτικῷ πράγματι, ἀλλὰ μόνῃ εὐχῇ καὶ ὁρκώσεσιν ἁπλουστέραις, καὶ ὅσα ἂν δύναιτο προσάγειν ἁπλούστερος ἄνθρωπος; ὡς ἐπίπαν γὰρ ἰδιῶται τὸ τοιοῦτον πράττουσι, παριστάσης τῆς ἐν τῷ λόγῳ Χριστοῦ χάριτος τὸ τῶν δαιμόνων εὐτελὲς καὶ ἀσθενὲς, οὐ πάντων δεόμενον, πρὸς τὸ ἡττηθῆναι, καὶ εἶξαν ὑπεξελθεῖν ἀπὸ ψυχῆς ἀνθρώπου καὶ σώματος, σοφοῦ τινος καὶ δυνατοῦ ἐν ταῖς λογικαῖς περὶ τῆς πίστεως ἀποδείξεσιν.*

[69] L. 4. c. 27. (v. 2. p. 249. 5.) *. Λαϊκὸς ὢν πολλὰ σημεῖα ἐποίησε, [illegible]ντας θεραπεύων, καὶ δαίμονας δι' ἐπιστολῶν φυγαδεύων.*

[70] Apol. c. 23. (p. 22 d.) Edatur hic aliquis sub tribunalibus vestris, quem dæmone agi constet. Jussus a quolibet Christiano loqui spiritus ille, tam se dæmonem confitebitur de vero, quam alibi deum de falso.

[71] Octav. p. 83. c. 27. (p. 139.) Ipsos dæmonas de semetipis confiteri, quoties a nobis tormentis verborum et orationis incendiis de corporibus exiguntur.

[72] Apol. 1. (p. 45 a.) *Δαιμονιολήπτους γὰρ πολλοὺς κατὰ πάντα τὸν κόσμον, καὶ ἐν τῇ ὑμετέρᾳ πόλει, πολλοὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἀνθρώπων τῶν Χριστιανῶν, ἐπορκίζοντες κατὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ σταυρωθέντος ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, ὑπὸ τῶν*

bius[75], though they frequently speak of such a power in the Church.

Bishops and presbyters, for the three first centuries, the usual exorcists of the Church.

2. But as this gift was common to all orders of men, so it is reasonable to believe that it was in a more especial manner conferred upon the bishops and presbyters of the Church, who, when there was any occasion to use any exorcism in the Church, were the ordinary ministers of it. Thus Cardinal Bona[76] understands that famous passage of Tertullian, where, speaking of a Christian woman who went to the theatre and returned possessed with a devil, he says[77] 'the unclean spirit was rebuked in exorcism for presuming to make such an

ἄλλων πάντων ἐπορκιστῶν καὶ ἐπαστῶν καὶ φαρμακευτῶν μὴ ἰαθέντας ἰάσαντο, καὶ ἔτι νῦν ἰῶνται, καταργοῦντες καὶ ἐκδιώκοντες τοὺς κατέχοντας τοὺς ἀνθρώπους δαίμονας.

[73] L. 2. c. 56. (p. 188. 7.) Nec enim [qui sunt a Simone et Carpocrate] cœcis possunt donare visum, neque surdis auditum, neque omnes dæmones effugare, præter eos, qui ab ipsis immittuntur, si tamen et hoc faciunt, &c.—C. 57. (ibid. 25.) In illius nomine, qui vere illius sunt discipuli, ab ipso accipientes gratiam, perficiunt ad beneficia reliquorum hominum, quemadmodum unusquisque accepit donum ab eo. Alii enim dæmones excludunt firmissime et vere, ut etiam sæpissime credant ipsi, qui emundati sunt a nequissimis spiritibus, et sint in ecclesia, &c.

[74] Ad Donat. p. 4. [Pamel. Ep. 2.] (p. 3.) Inde jam facultas datur, castitate sobria, mente integra, voce pura, in medelam dolentium, posse venenorum virus extinguere; animorum desipientium labes reddita sanitate purgare; infestis jubere pacem, violentis quietem, ferocientibus lenitatem; immundos et erraticos spiritus, qui se expugnandis hominibus immerserint, ad confessionem minis increpantibus cogere; ut recedant duris vulneribus urgere; conflictantes, ejulantes, gementes, incremento pœnæ propagantis extendere, flagris cædere, igne torrere.

[75] Cont. Gent. l. 1. (p. 30.) Quid? quod istas virtutes, quæ sunt a nobis summatim, non, ut rei poscebat magnitudo, depromtæ, non tantum ipse perfecit vi sua, verum, quod erat sublimius, multos alios experiri, et facere sui nominis cum adfectione permisit. Nam cum videret [Christus] futuros vos esse gestarum ab se rerum divinique operis abrogatores, ne qua subesset suspicio, magicis se artibus munera illa beneficiaque largitum, ex immensa illa populi multitudine, quæ suam gratiam sectabatur admirans, piscatores, opifices, rusticanos, atque id genus, delegit imperitorum, qui per varias gentes missi, cuncta illa miracula sine ullis fucis atque adminiculis perpetrarent. Verbo ille compescuit verminantium membrorum cruces: et illi verbo compescuerunt furialium vermina passionum. Imperio ille uno exturbavit a corporibus dæmonas, et exanimatis suos restituit sensus: sub eorum tortantes et illi se casibus, jussione non alia sanitati et constantiæ reddiderunt. [*Tortantes* is Maire's reading for *portantes*. Heraldus suggests *rotantes*. Ed.]

[76] Rer. Liturg. l. 1. c. 25. n. 17. (p. 267.) An vero isti [Tertullianus nempe et Minucius] de exorcistis loquantur, tanquam de clericis ad hoc officium specialiter ordinatis; vel potius presbyteri eo tunc munere fungerentur, sicut revera functi sunt episcopi.... incertum est.

[77] De Spectac. c. 26. (p. 83 c.) Theatrum adiit, et inde cum dæmonio rediit. Itaque in exorcismo cum oneraretur immundus spiritus, quod ausus esset fidelem aggredi: Constanter et justissime quidem, inquit, feci; in meo eam inveni.

attempt upon a believer;' to which the spirit replied 'that he had a right to her, because he found her upon his own ground.' This exorcism, I say, Bona supposes to be performed by some presbyter of the Church, endowed with that miraculous gift. And the like may be said of those exorcists in Cyprian[78], who cast out devils by a divine power: and of those also who are mentioned by Firmilian[79], as persons inspired by divine grace to discern evil spirits and detect them; as one of them did a woman of Cappadocia, who pretended to be inspired, and to work miracles, and to baptize, and consecrate the eucharist by divine direction. These exorcisms were plainly miraculous, and prove nothing more than that some persons had such a gift, who probably were some eminent presbyters of the Church: at least they do not prove that exorcists were as yet become any distinct orders among the clergy in the Church.

In what sense every man his own exorcist.

3. Some think the order was as old as Tertullian, because Ulpian, the great lawyer, who lived in Tertullian's time, in one of his books[80] speaks of exorcising as a thing used by impostors, by whom probably he means the Christians. Gothofred thinks he means the Jewish exorcists, who were commonly impostors indeed. But admitting that he means Christians, (which is more probable, considering what Lactantius says of him[81], 'that he published a collection of the penal laws that had been made against them,') yet it proves no more than what every one owns,—that exorcising was a thing then commonly known and practised among the Christians. Others urge the authority of Tertullian himself in his book *De Corona Militis;*

[78] Ep. 76. [al. 69.] ad Magn. p. 187. (p. 299.) Quod hodie etiam geritur, ut per exorcistas, voce humana et potestate divina, flagelletur, et uratur, et torqueatur diabolus.

[79] Ep. 75. ap. Cypr. p. 223. (p. 323.) Unus de exorcistis, vir probatus et circa religiosam disciplinam bene semper conversatus, qui exhortatione quoque fratrum plurimorum, qui et ipsi fortes ac laudabiles in fide aderant, excitatus, erexit se contra illum spiritum nequam revincendum; qui subtili fallacia etiam hoc paullo ante prædixerat, venturum quemdam aversum et tentatorem infidelem. Tamen ille exorcista inspiratus Dei gratia fortiter restitit, et esse illum nequissimum spiritum, qui prius sanctus putabatur, ostendit.

[80] L. 8. de Tribun. in Digest. l. 50. tit. 13. leg. 1. n. 3. (ap. Corp. Jur. Civ. t. 3. p. 1781.) .. Si incantavit, si imprecatus est, si (ut vulgari verbo impostorum utor) exorcizavit.

[81] Instit. l. 3. c. 11. (t. 1. p. 390.) Domitius de officio proconsulis libro septimo rescripta principum nefaria colligit, ut doceret quibus pœnis offici oporteret eos, qui se cultores Dei confiterentur.

where yet he is so far from owning any particular order of exorcists, that he rather seems to make every man his own exorcist. For there among other arguments which he urges to dissuade Christians from a military life under heathen emperors, he makes use of this[82], 'that they would be put to guard the idol-temples, and then they must defend those devils by night, whom they had put to flight by day by their exorcisms;' by which he means their prayers, as Junius rightly understands him. And so in another place, dissuading Christians from selling such things as would contribute towards upholding of idolatry, or the worship of devils, he argues thus; that otherwise the devils would be their *alumni;* that is, might be said to be fostered and maintained by them, so long as they furnished out materials to carry on their service. 'And with what confidence,' says he[83], 'can any man exorcise his own *alumni*, those devils, whose service he makes his own house an armoury to maintain?' Vicecomes[84] and Bona[85], by mistake, understand this as spoken of exorcism before baptism, taking the word *alumni* to signify the catechumens of the Church; whereas indeed it signifies devils in this place, who are so called by Tertullian, in respect of those who contribute to uphold their worship; for such men are a sort of foster-fathers to them. So that this passage, when rightly understood, makes nothing for the antiquity of exorcists as a peculiar order of the clergy, but only shews in what sense every Christian is to be his own exorcist, viz. by his prayers, resisting the devil that he may fly from him.

Exorcists constituted into an order in the latter end of the third century.

4. Setting aside then both that extraordinary power of exorcising, which was miraculous, and this ordinary way also, in which every man was his own exorcist, it remains to be inquired,—When the order of the exorcists was first settled in the Church? And here I take Bona's opinion to be the

[82] De Cor. Mil. c. 11. (p. 117 c.) Quos interdiu exorcismis fugavit, noctibus defensabit, &c.

[83] De Idol. c. 11. (p. 92 a.) Qua constantia exorcizabit alumnos suos, quibus domum suam cellariam præstat?

[84] De Rit. Bapt. l. 2. c. 29. (p. 362.) Ante quod tempus innumeri scriptores baptismalis exorcismi meminerunt, &c.

[85] Rer. Liturg. l. 1. c. 27. n. 17. (p. 267.) Omitto alia Tertulliani loca, quæ a quibusdam afferri solent ad hujus ordinis antiquitatem ostendendam, ut de Idololatria c. 11., de Anima c. 57., de Corona Militis c. 11.: in his enim de solemni exorcismo sermo est, qui baptismo præmitti solet.

truest[86], 'that it came in upon the withdrawing of that extraordinary and miraculous power;' which probably was by degrees, and not at the same time in all places. Cornelius[87], who lived in the third century, reckons exorcists among the inferior orders of the Church of Rome. Yet the author of the Constitutions, who lived after him, says[88] 'it was no certain order, but God bestowed the gift of exorcising as a free grace upon whom he pleased;' and therefore, consonant to that hypothesis, there is no rule among those Constitutions for giving any ordination to exorcists, as being appointed by God only, and not by the Church. But the credit of the Constitutions is not to be relied upon in this matter; for it is certain by this time exorcists were settled as an order in most parts of the Greek Church, as well as the Latin: which is evident from the Council of Antioch, anno 341, in one of whose canons[89] leave is given to the *chorepiscopi* to promote subdeacons, readers, and exorcists; which argues that those were then all standing orders of the Church. After this exorcists are frequently mentioned among the inferior orders by the writers of the fourth century, as in the Council of Laodicea[90], Epiphanius[91], Paulinus[92], Sulpicius Severus[93], and the Rescripts of

[86] Ibid. Postea subtracta hac potestate, constituit ecclesia ordinem, qui dæmonia expelleret.

[87] Ap. Euseb. l. 7. c. 43. See before, ch. 1. s. 2. p. 305. n. 22.

[88] L. 8. c. 26. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 410.) ...Ἐπορκιστὴς οὐ χειροτονεῖται· εὐνοίας γὰρ ἑκουσίου τὸ ἔπαθλον, καὶ χάριτος Θεοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ, ἐπιφοιτήσει τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος.

[89] C. 10. (t. 2. p. 565 c.) Τοὺς ἐν ταῖς κώμαις, ἢ ταῖς χώραις, ἢ τοὺς καλουμένους χωρεπισκόπους.. ἔδοξε τῇ ἁγίᾳ συνόδῳ.. καθιστᾶν ἀναγνώστας, καὶ ὑποδιακόνους, καὶ ἐπορκιστάς.

[90] C. 24. (t. 1. p. 1501 a.) Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἱερατικοὺς ἀπὸ πρεσβυτέρων ἕως διακόνων, καὶ ἑξῆς τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς τάξεως ἕως ὑπηρετῶν, ἢ ἀναγνωστῶν, ἢ ψαλτῶν, ἢ ἐπορκιστῶν, ἢ θυρωρῶν, ἢ τοῦ τάγματος τῶν ἀσκητῶν, εἰς καπηλεῖον εἰσιέναι.—C. 26. (ibid. b.) Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἐπορκίζειν τοὺς μὴ προαχθέντας ὑπὸ ἐπισκόπων, μήτε ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, μήτε ἐν ταῖς οἰκίαις.

[91] Expos. Fid. n. 21. See ch. 1. s. 2. p. 305. n. 21.

[92] Natal. 4. S. Felic. (p. 545.)
...Primis lector servivit in annis:
Inde gradum cepit, cui munus voce fideli
Adjurare malos et sacris pellere verbis.
Quod quia perspicua meriti virtute regebat,
Jure sacerdotis veneranda insignia nactus
Mente loco digna meritum decoravit honorem.

[93] Vit. B. Martin. c. 4. (p. 465.) Tentavit autem idem Hilarius, imposito diaconi officio, sibi eum [Martinum] arctius implicare, et ministerio vincire divino: sed cum sæpissime restitisset, indignum se esse vociferans, intellexit vir altioris ingenii, hoc eum modo posse constringi, si id ei officii imponeret, in quo quidam locus injuriæ videretur. Itaque exorcistam eum esse præcepit. Quam ille ordinationem, ne despexisse tamquam humiliorem videretur, non repudiavit.

Theodosius[94], and Gratian[95] in the Theodosian Code, where those emperors grant them the same immunity from civil offices, as they do to the other orders of the clergy.

Their ordination and office.

5. Their ordination and office is thus described by the fourth Council of Carthage[96]: 'When an exorcist is ordained, he shall receive at the hands of the bishop a book, wherein the forms of exorcizing are written, the bishop saying, Receive thou these, and commit them to memory, and have thou power to lay hands upon the energumens, whether they be baptized or only catechumens.' These forms were certain prayers, together with adjurations in the name of Christ, commanding the unclean spirit to depart out of the possessed person: which may be collected from the words of Paulinus, concerning the promotion of St. Felix to this office, where he says[97], 'from a reader he arose to that degree, whose office was to adjure evil spirits, and to drive them out by certain holy words.' It does not appear that they were ordained to this office by any imposition of hands either in the Greek or Latin Church; but yet no one might pretend to exercise it either publicly or privately, in the church or in any house, without the appointment of the bishop, as the Council of Laodicea[98] directs; or at least the licence of a *chorepiscopus*, who in that case was authorized by the bishop's deputation[99].

A short account of the energumens, their names and station in the Church.

6. As to the energumens, for whose sake this office was appointed, they were so called from the Greek word ἐνεργούμενοι, which in its largest signification denotes *persons who are under the motion and operation of any spirit, whether good or bad;* but, in a more restrained sense, it is used by ecclesiastical writers for *persons whose bodies are seized or*

[94] L. 12. tit. 1. de Decurionibus, leg. 121. (t. 4. p. 464.) Qui ante secundum consulatum mansuetudinis meæ ex ordine curialis vel presbyteri fastigium, vel ministerium diaconi, vel exorcistæ suscepit officium, omne ejus patrimonium immune a curialibus nexibus habeatur ac liberum.

[95] L. 16. tit. 2. de Episcopis, leg. 24. (t. 6. p. 56.) Presbyteros, diaconos, atque exorcistas et lectores, ostiarios etiam, et omnes perinde, qui primi sunt, personalium munerum expertes esse præcipimus.

[96] C. 7. (t. 2. p. 1200 c.) Exorcista cum ordinatur, accipiat de manu episcopi libellum, in quo scripti sunt exorcismi, dicente sibi episcopo: Accipe et commenda memoriæ, et habeto potestatem imponendi manus super energumenum, sive baptizatum, sive catechumenum.

[97] See n. 92, preceding.

[98] C. 26. See n. 90, preceding.

[99] Vid. C. Antioch. c. 10. See n. 89, preceding.

possessed with an evil spirit. Upon which account they are otherwise called δαιμονιζόμενοι, *dæmoniacs*, and κατεχόμενοι, *possessed*. And because this was frequently attended with great commotions and vexations and disturbances of the body, occasioning sometimes phrensy and madness, sometimes epileptic fits, and other violent tossings and contortions; such persons are often upon that account styled χειμαζόμενοι by the Greek, and *hyemantes* by the Latin writers; that is, *tossed as in a winter-storm or tempest.* Thus the author of the Constitutions in some places[1] styles them simply χειμαζόμενοι, by which that he means *the energumens* is evident, because in another place[2] he styles them χειμαζόμενοι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀλλοτρίου, *such as were under the commotions and vexations of Satan*, and tells us that prayer was made for them, under that character, in the oblation at the altar for all states and conditions of men, that God would deliver them from that violent energy or agitation of the wicked one. And thus most learned men, except Albaspinæus, understand that phrase in the canon of the Council of Ancyra[3], which orders some certain notorious sinners εἰς τοὺς χειμαζομένους εὔχεσθαι, *to pray in loco hyemantium*, in that part of the church where the dæmoniacs stood, which was a place separate from all the rest. And some also think[4] the name κλυδωνιζόμενοι was given to the energumens upon the same account, because it signifies *persons agitated by a spirit, as a wave in a tempest.*

7. Now these energumens, or dæmoniacs, or whatever other name they were called by, were the persons about whom the exorcists were chiefly concerned. For besides the prayers

[1] L. 8. c. 35. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 416.) Ἑσπέρας γενομένης συναθροίσεις τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ὦ ἐπίσκοπε, καὶ μετὰ τὸ ῥηθῆναι τὸν ἐπιλύχνιον ψαλμὸν, προσφωνήσει ὁ διάκονος ὑπὲρ τῶν κατηχουμένων καὶ χειμαζομένων καὶ τῶν φωτιζομένων καὶ τῶν ἐν μετανοίᾳ. —C. 37. (ibid. p. 417.) Ὡσαύτως ὄρθρου, ὁ διάκονος, μετὰ τὸ ῥηθῆναι τὸν ὀρθρινὸν, καὶ ἀπολῦσαι αὐτὸν τοὺς κατηχουμένους καὶ χειμαζομένους καὶ βαπτιζομένους καὶ τοὺς ἐν μετανοίᾳ, κ. τ. λ.

[2] L. 8. c. 12. (ibid. p. 403.) Ἔτι παρακαλοῦμέν σε καὶ ὑπὲρ κατηχουμένων τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν χειμαζομένων ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀλλοτρίου . . . ὅπως . . . καθαρίσῃς ἐκ τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ πονηροῦ.

[3] C. 17. (t. 1. p. 1461 e.) Τοὺς ἀλογευσαμένους καὶ λεπροὺς ὄντας ἤτοι λεπρώσαντας, τούτους προσέταξεν ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος εἰς τοὺς χειμαζομένους εὔχεσθαι.

[4] Dodwell, Dissert. Cyprian. 1. n. 17. (ac calc. Oper. Cypr. p. 7.) Propius ad MSS. fidem accedet, si *klydonizomeni* legamus, et de energumenis sive maniacis intelligamus, qui lymphatici Latinis, χειμαζόμενοι Græcis quoque patribus audiunt. Item enim valet primaria quoque significatione χειμαζόμενοι quod κλυδωνιζόμενοι.

which were offered for them in all public assemblies, by the deacons and bishops, and the whole congregation, (some forms of which prayers may be seen in the author of the Constitutions[5],) the exorcists were obliged to pray over them at other times[6], when there was no assembly in the church; and to keep them employed in some innocent business, as in sweeping[7] the church and the like, to prevent more violent agitations of Satan, lest idleness should tempt the tempter; and to see them provided of daily food and sustenance[8], while they abode in the church, which it seems was the chief place of their residence and habitation.

The duty of exorcists in reference to the catechumens.

8. This was the exorcists' office in reference to the energumens; to which Valesius[9] and Gothofred[10] add another office, viz. that of *exorcizing the catechumens* before baptism; which is a matter that will admit of some dispute. For it does not appear always to have been the exorcists' office, save only in one of these two cases; either, first, when a catechumen was also an energumen, which was a case that very often happened; and then he was to be committed to the care of the exorcists, whose office was to exorcize all energumens, whether they were baptized, or only catechumens, as is evident from the canon already alleged[11] out of the Council of Carthage. Or, secondly, it might happen that the exorcist was also made the catechist, and in that case there can be no question but that his office was as well to exorcise as to instruct the catechumens. But then the catechist's office was many times separate from that

[5] L. 8. c. 6. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 394.) *Εὔξασθε οἱ ἐνεργούμενοι ὑπὸ πνευμάτων ἀκαθάρτων. ἐκτενῶς πάντες ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν δεηθῶμεν, ὅπως ὁ φιλάνθρωπος Θεὸς διὰ Χριστοῦ ἐπιτιμήσῃ τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις καὶ πονηροῖς πνεύμασι, κ.τ.λ.*

[6] Vid. C. Carth. 4. c. 90. (t. 2. p. 1207 a.) Omni die exorcistæ energumenis manus imponant.

[7] C. 91. (ibid.) Pavimenta domorum Dei energumeni verrant.

[8] C. 92. (ibid.) Energumenis in domo Dei assidentibus victus quotidianus per exorcistas opportuno tempore ministretur.

[9] Not. in Euseb. de Mart. Palæstin. c. 2. (v. 1. p. 409. n. 4.) Nec semel duntaxat exsufflabantur atque exorcizabantur catechumeni: sed post singulas catecheses discincti et excalceati deducebantur ad exorcistam, ut ab eo purgarentur.

[10] Not. in Cod. Theod. l. 16. tit. 2. leg. 24. (t. 6. p. 57.) *Exorcismi* et *exorcizandi* usus, nascente ecclesia, fuit dæmoniorum ejiciendorum potestas. Mox translatus usus ad baptismum et catechumenos: credito semel, malum spiritum hominem nascentem inhabitare, qui baptismo excludi deberet. Itaque exorcismi et exorcistarum geminus jam usus fuit extra domum [leg. donum] miraculi: catechumenos videlicet instituere et baptismo intervenire, spiritu immundo depellendo.

[11] See s. 5 and n. 96, preceding.

of the exorcist, though some modern writers confound them together. Sometimes a presbyter, or a deacon, or a reader, was the catechist; and in that case it seems more probable that the exorcism of the catechumens was performed by the catechist than by the exorcist; and for that reason I shall treat of the office of catechist distinctly in its proper place.

CHAP. V.

Of lectors or readers.

The order of readers not instituted till the third century.

1. It is the opinion now of most learned men, even in the Romish Church, that there was no such order as that of readers, distinct from others, for at least two ages in the primitive Church. Bona[12] owns it to be one of the four orders, which he thinks only of ecclesiastical institution. And Cotelerius[13] says there is no mention made of it before the time of Tertullian, who is the first author that speaks of it as a standing order in the Church: for, writing against the heretics[14], he objects to them, 'that their orders were desultory and inconstant; a man was a deacon among them one day and a reader the next:' which implies that it was otherwise in the Church, and that readers then were as much a settled order as deacons or any other. Cyprian, who lived not long after Tertullian, frequently speaks of them as an order of the clergy. In one[15] place he says he had made one Saturus a reader; and in an-

[12] Rer. Liturg. l. 1. c. 25. n. 17. (p. 267.) Dicendum igitur cum S. Thoma, *in Supplem. part. tert. quæst.* 37. *art.* 2., quod temporibus Apostolorum omnia ministeria, quæ ordinibus minoribus competunt, non a distinctis personis, sed ab uno duntaxat ministro exercebantur, qui et ostiarii et lectoris et exorcistæ et acolythi officio fungebatur. Verba angelici doctoris hæc sunt: '*In primitiva ecclesia,*' &c. [See before, ch. 1. s. 1. p. 303. n. 12.] Contigit nimirum ecclesiæ, quod hominibus solet, qui, dum tenue patrimonium habent, uno servo contenti sunt, qui solus omnia administrat. Si vero reditus augeantur, servorum etiam augetur numerus; eoque magis crescit familia, quo illi locupletiores et spectabiliores evadunt. Sic, evangelicæ prædicationis initio, parvula adhuc et latitans ecclesia paucis indiguit ecclesiasticarum functionum ministris. Crescente autem credentium multitudine, et auctis facultatibus ex fidelium oblationibus, cum soli diaconi non possent omnibus incumbere, diversa onera et officia diversis personis distributa sunt: ex quo factum est, ut splendidiori et augustiori apparatu ecclesiasticarum functionum ceremoniæ peragerentur.

[13] Not. in Constit. Apost. l. 2. c. 25. (v. 1. p. 238. n. 75.) Primus vero, quod sciam, lectores nominat Tertullianus libro de Præscriptione Hæreticorum, cap. 41.

[14] De Præscript. c. 41. (p. 217.) ... Hodie diaconus, qui cras lector.

[15] Ep. 24. [al. 29.] (p. 208.) Fecisse me sciatis lectorem Saturum.

other place[16] he mentions one Aurelius, a confessor, whom he had ordained a reader for his singular merits, and constancy in time of persecution: and for the same reason he made Celerinus[17], another confessor, one of the same order among the clergy. So that it was then reckoned not only a clerical office, but an honourable office, to be a reader in the Church, and such an one as a confessor needed not to be ashamed of. Sometimes persons of the greatest dignity were ordained to this office, as Julian is said to have been in the Church of Nicomedia[18] while he professed himself a Christian. Sozomen says expressly[19], 'that both he and his brother Gallus were reckoned among the clergy, and read the Scriptures publicly to the people.' And there is no writer of that age but always speaks of readers as a distinct order of the clergy in the Church.

By whom the Scriptures were read in the Church before the institution of that order.

2. But since the order of readers, though frequently spoken of in the third and fourth ages, are never once mentioned in the two first, it will be proper to inquire,—By whom the Scriptures were read in the church for those two centuries? Mr. Basnage[20] is of opinion that the Christian Church at first

[16] Ep. 33. [al. 38.] (p. 222.) Merebatur talis [Aurelius] clericæ ordinationis ulteriores gradus ... Sed interim placuit ut ab officio lectionis incipiat, &c.

[17] Ep. 34. [al. 39.] (p. 223.) Referimus ad vos Celerinum .... clero nostro non humana suffragatione, sed divina dignatione conjunctum, &c.

[18] Vid. Socrat. l. 3. c. 1. (v. 2. p. 169. 12.) Καὶ δὴ τῆς ἐν Νικομηδείᾳ ἐκκλησίας ἀναγνώστης καθίσταται.—Greg. Naz. [Orat. 3.] Invect. 1. (t. 1. p. 58 d.) .... Τῷ μέν γε κλήρῳ φέροντες ἑαυτοὺς ἐγκατέλεξαν, ὥστε καὶ τὰς θείας ὑπαναγινώσκειν τῷ λαῷ βίβλους, κ. τ. λ.

[19] L. 5. c. 2. (ibid. p. 180. 14.) Ἔνθα δὴ θεραπείας καὶ ἀγωγῆς βασιλικῆς ἠξιοῦντο, καὶ μαθήμασι καὶ γυμνασίοις τοῖς καθ' ἡλικίαν ἐχρῶντο, καὶ λόγων διδασκάλοις, καὶ τοῖς ὑφηγηταῖς τῶν ἁγίων γραφῶν. Ὡς καὶ κλήρῳ ἐγκαταλεγῆναι, καὶ ὑπαναγινώσκειν τῷ λαῷ τὰς ἐκκλησιαστικὰς βίβλους.

[20] Exercit. in Baron. an. 44. (pp. 622 seqq.) Liceat mihi pauca eruditi Lightfootii referre, ad perantiquum juxta ac sanctissimum morem explicandum. *Die sabbati erant septem lectores legis, die expiationis sex, diebus festis quinque, novilunii septemque diebus solemnium festorum quatuor, secundo quintoque septimanæ die tres. Porro lex a paucioribus quam tribus legi non poterat: a tribus, inquam, sibi invicem succedentibus. Septem sabbato lectores hoc ordine legebant: primo sacerdos, tum Levita, deinde quinque Israelitæ sibi invicem succedentes. Si nullus illic adesset sacerdos aut Levita, septem tum Israelitæ legebant. Si adesset illic sacerdos nullusque Levita, tunc bis sacerdos legebat ..... שליח צבור, Angelus ecclesiæ, aut minister congregationis, evocabat eum qui lecturus erat, conscendebatque is cathedram* (בימה βῆμα) *in medio synagogæ positam hunc ad usum, eique librum legis tradebat, quem aperiebat, inspiciebatque, quis*

followed the example of the Jewish Church, and in this matter took her model from the Synagogue; where, as he observes out of Dr. Lightfoot[21], the custom was on every sabbath-day to have seven readers, first a priest, then a Levite, and after them five Israelites, such as the minister of the congregation (whom they called the bishop or inspector and angel of the Church) thought fit to call forth and nominate for that purpose. He thinks it was much after the same manner in the Christian Church; the office was not perpetually assigned to any particular man, but chiefly performed by presbyters and deacons, yet so as that any other might do it by the bishop's appointment. But indeed the matter is involved in so great obscurity, that no certain conjectures can be made from the writings of the two first ages; but all that we can argue is from the seeming remains of the ancient customs in the following ages. For since we find that deacons in many Churches continued to read the Gospel, even after the order of readers was set up, as I have had occasion to shew in another place[22] from the author of the Constitutions[23], and St. Jerom[24], and the Council of Vaison[25], we may thence reasonably conclude, that this was part of their office before; and since presbyters and bishops in other Churches did the same, as Sozomen[26] in-

locus legendus esset; sed non incipiebat, donec archisynagogus incipere ipsum juberet .... Priusquam legeret, inchoabat ab oratione, benedictione laudationeque Dei, quod eos in populum suum elegisset, suamque ipsis legem dedisset. Tum incipit; stansque toto tempore legit .... Ut legebat, stabat juxta minister congregationis, quo attenderet, rectene pronuntiaret legeretque: hincque dicebatur חזן, *episcopus aut superinspector, ut supra observatum est.* Lightfoot. Harm. p. 479. Huic exercendo muneri nullus ordo sacer requirebatur: idcirco Christus, qui nec ortum ducebat a tribu Levitica, nec a popularibus secus habebatur atque homo plebeius, *cum venisset Nazaretham, ubi fuerat nutritus, intravit, ut consueverat, die sabbati in synagogam, καὶ ἀνέστη ἀναγνῶναι, et surrexit ut legeret.* Luc. 4, 16.—Hunc in legendo morem a priscis Christianis observatum fuisse quam probabilissimum est.

[21] Harmony, (v. 5. p. 123.) on the Sabbath the readers of the Law were seven, &c.—See the preceding note.

[22] B. 2. ch. 20. s. 6. p. 252.

[23] L. 2. c. 57. See ibid. n. 60.

[24] Ep. 48. [al. 147.] ad Sabinian. (t. 1. p. 1084 d.) Evangelium Christi, quasi diaconus, lectitabat.

[25] Vasens. 2. c. 2. (t. 4. p. 1680 b.) Si enim digni sunt diacones quod Christus in evangelio loquutus est legere, quare indigni judicentur sanctorum patrum expositiones publice recitare?

[26] L. 7. c. 19. (v. 2. p. 308. 1.) *Ταύτην δὲ τὴν ἱερὰν βίβλον ἀναγινώσκει ἐνθάδε μόνος ὁ ἀρχιδιάκονος· παρὰ δὲ ἄλλοις, διάκονοι· ἐν πολλαῖς δὲ ἐκκλησίαις, οἱ ἱερεῖς μόνοι· ἐν δὲ ἐπισήμοις ἡμέραις, ἐπίσκοποι, ὡς ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει, κατὰ τὴν πρώτην ἡμέραν τῆς ἀναστασίμου ἑορτῆς.*

forms us, it may as rationally be inferred that this was their custom in former ages. But whether laymen performed this office at any time by the bishop's particular direction, as the Israelites did in the Jewish Church, cannot be so certainly determined. Only we find that in after-ages, in the most celebrated Church of Alexandria, even the catechumens, as well as believers[27], were admitted to do the office of readers; and that may incline a man to think that this office was not wholly confined to the clergy in the two first ages. But this being peculiar to the Church of Alexandria, nothing can be argued from it concerning the practice of the Universal Church; and therefore till some better light is afforded, I leave this matter undetermined.

The manner of ordaining readers.

3. It is more certain that, after the order of readers was set up, it was generally computed among the orders of the clergy; except perhaps at Alexandria, where that singular custom prevailed of putting catechumens into the office. For it can hardly be supposed that they reckoned persons that were unbaptized, and not yet allowed to partake of the holy mysteries, into the number of their clergy. But in all other places it was reputed a clerical order, and persons deputed to the office were ordained to it with the usual solemnities and ceremonies of the other inferior orders. In the Greek Church, Habertus[28] thinks they were ordained with imposition of hands, but among the Latins without it. The author of the Constitutions prescribes a form of prayer to be used with imposition of hands; but whether that was the practice of all the Greek Church is very much questioned. In the Latin Church it was certainly otherwise. The Council of Carthage[29] speaks of no other ceremony, but the bishop's putting the Bible into his hands in the presence of the people, with these words: 'Take this book, and be thou a

[27] Vid. Socrat. l. 5. c. 22. (ibid. p. 296. 9.) Ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ δὲ Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ἀναγνῶσται καὶ ὑποβολεῖς ἀδιάφορον, εἴτε κατηχούμενοι εἰσὶν, εἴτε πιστοί.

[28] Archierat. part. 4. observ. 1. (p. 41.) Ordinatur lector absque manus impositione apud Latinos, sed a Græcis cum ea tanquam communi ordinum materia, &c.

[29] Carth. 4. c. 8. (t. 2. p. 1200 c.) Lector cum ordinatur, faciat de illo verbum episcopus ad plebem, indicans ejus fidem, [ac] vitam, atque ingenium. Post hæc, spectante plebe, tradat ei codicem, de quo lecturus est, dicens, Accipe et esto lector Verbi Dei, habiturus, si fideliter et utiliter impleveris officium, partem cum eis qui Verbum Dei ministraverint.

reader of the Word of God; which office if thou fulfil faithfully and profitably, thou shalt have part with those that minister in the Word of God.' And in Cyprian's time they seem not to have had so much as this ceremony of delivering the Bible to them, but they were made readers by the bishop's commission and deputation only to such a station in the Church.

eir station and ice in the urch.

4. This was the *pulpitum*, or *tribunal ecclesiæ*, as it is commonly called in Cyprian, *the reading-desk* in the body of the church, which was distinguished from the *bema* or *tribunal* of the sanctuary. For the reader's office was not to read the Scriptures at the altar, but in the reading-desk only. Whence *super pulpitum imponi* and *ad pulpitum venire* are phrases in Cyprian[30] to denote the ordination of a reader. In this place, in Cyprian's time, they read the Gospels as well as other parts of Scripture, which is clear from one of Cyprian's Epistles[31]; where, speaking of Celerinus the confessor, whom he had ordained a reader, he says, 'it was fitting he should be advanced to the pulpit or tribunal of the church, that having the advantage of an higher station, he might thence read the precepts and Gospels of his Lord, which he himself as a courageous confessor had followed and observed.' Albaspiny says[32] they also read the Epistles and Gospels in the communion-service; but he should first have proved that those were anciently any part of the communion-service. For they do not appear to have been so from the most ancient Liturgies, but were only read in the *missa catechumenorum*, or, as we now call it, *the first service*, at which the catechumens were present: and wheresoever they were taken into the communion-service, it was the office of deacons, and not the readers, to rehearse them. But of this more when we come to the liturgy and service of the ancient Church.

[30] Ep. 33. [al. 38.] (p. 222.)..... Nihil magis congruit voci, quæ Dominum gloriosa prædicatione confessa est, quam celebrandis divinis lectionibus personare: post verba sublimia quæ Christi martyrium proloquuta sunt, evangelium Christi legere, unde martyres fiunt: ad pulpitum post catastam venire, &c.

[31] Ep. 34. [al. 39.] (p. 224.) Hunc [Celerinum] ad nos.... cum tanta Domini dignatione venientem..... quid aliud quam super pulpitum, id est, super tribunal ecclesiæ oportebat imponi, ut loci altioris celsitate subnixus .... legat præcepta et evangelia Domini, quæ fortiter ac fideliter sequitur?

[32] Not. in C. Carth. 3. c. 4. (CC. t. 2. p. 1185 c.) Vetus ille mos invaluerat, ut non diaconi, sed lectores, epistolas et evangelia in solenni missæ sacrificio pronuntiarent.

5. There is but one thing more to be noted concerning this order, which is *the age* at which readers might be ordained. That is fixed by one of Justinian's Novels[33], precisely forbidding any one to be ordained reader before he was completely eighteen years old. But before this law was made, it was customary to ordain them much younger; for Ennodius[34], bishop of Ticinum, says of Epiphanius his predecessor, that he was ordained reader at eight years old; as Cæsarius Arelatensis[35] is said to have been at seven. And this leads us to understand what Sidonius Apollinaris means, when, speaking of John, bishop of Chalons, he says[36] 'he was a reader from his infancy.' Which is also said of St. Felix by Paulinus[37], that he served in the office of a reader from his tender years. So Victor Uticensis, describing the barbarity of the Vandalic persecution in Afric, aggravates their cruelty with this circumstance[38], 'that they had murdered or famished all the clergy of Carthage, five hundred or more, among whom there were many infant readers.' Now the reason why persons were ordained so young to this office was what I have intimated before, that parents sometimes dedicated their children to the service of God from their infancy, and then they were trained up and disciplined in some inferior offices, that they might be qualified and rendered more expert for the greater services of the Church.

The age at which they might be ordained.

[33] Novel. 123. c. 13. (t. 5. p. 546.) .... Neque minorem lectorem decem et octo annorum [fieri permittimus.]

[34] Vit. Epiphan. Bibl. Patr. t. 15. p. 295. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 9. p. 383 d. 15.).... Annorum ferme octo lectoris ecclesiastici suscipit officium.

[35] Vit. Cæsar. ap. Sur. 27. Aug. (t. 4. p. 944.) Clero adscriptum inter ipsa infantiæ rudimenta, post exactum ætatis septennium. [The citation as given is not to be found in Surius, q.v. He says indeed, *Cumque is sanctus puer septimum aut eo amplius ætatis ageret annum ex vestibus, quas apud se habebat, incunctanter pauperibus impertiebatur,*— but nothing is stated of his ordination as lector.—Conf. Cyprian. Gall. Vit. Cæsar. Arelat. (Ed. Lugd. 1613. 4to.) which book the author cites in his Index Auctorum, but I cannot meet with a copy after many inquiries. Ed.]

[36] L. 4. Ep. 25. (p. 310.) Lector hic primum, sic minister altaris, idque ab infantia.

[37] Natal. 4. S. Felic. (p. 545.) Primis lector servivit in annis.

[38] De Persecut. Vandal. l. 3. Bibl. Patr. t. 7. p. 613. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 8. [l. 5.] p. 694 f. 1.) Tunc Eugenio pastore jam in exsilio constituto, universus clerus ecclesiæ Carthaginis cæde inediaque maceratur, fere quingenti vel amplius, inter quos quamplurimi erant lectores infantuli, qui gaudentes in Domino procul exsilio crudeli funduntur.

CHAP. VI.

Of the ostiarii or door-keepers.

Enumeration of the orders established in the fourth century.

1. Last in the rank of those five orders which are pretended by the present Church of Rome to be of apostolical institution: but for three whole centuries we never so much as meet with the name of it in any ancient writer, except in the Epistle of Cornelius[39], bishop of Rome, where the πυλωροὶ, or *door-keepers*, are mentioned with the rest. In Cyprian and Tertullian there is no mention of them. The first and lowest order with them is that of readers, as it is now in the Greek Church, among whom the order of door-keepers has been laid aside from the time of the Council of Trullo, anno 692: as Scheistrate[40] scruples not to confess, though he blames Morinus for being a little too frank and liberal in extending this concession to the apostolical ages; and, in order to confute him, alleges the authority of Ignatius[41] and Clemens Romanus[42] for the antiquity of this order. But he refers us only to spurious treatises under their names, not known till the fourth century; about which time it is owned this order began to be spoken of by some few Greek writers. For Epiphanius[43] and the Council of Laodicea[44] put the θυρωροὶ, that is, *door-keepers*, among the other orders of the clergy: and Justinian also, in one of his Novels[45], speaks of them as settled in the great church of Constantinople, where he limits their number to one hundred, for the use of that and three other churches. This proves that they were settled in some parts of the Greek Church, though, as Habertus observes[46], they continued not many ages, nor ever universally obtained an establishment in all Churches.

The manner of their

2. What sort of ordination they had in the Greek Church

[39] Ap. Euseb. l. 6. c. 43. See ch. 1. s. 2. p. 305. n. 22.

[40] C. Antioch. Restitut. dissert. 4. c. 17. p. 520. See ibid. s. 1. p. 302. n. 4.

[41] Ep. ad Antioch. n. 12. See ibid. s. 2. p. 305. n. 16.

[42] Constit. Apost. l. 3. c. 11. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 284.) Ἀλλ' οὔτε τοῖς λοιποῖς κληρικοῖς ἐπιτρέπομεν βαπτίζειν· οἷον ἀναγνώστοις, ἢ ψαλταῖς, ἢ πυλωροῖς, ἢ ὑπηρέταις, κ. τ. λ.

[43] Expos. Fid. n. 21. See ch. 1. s. 2. p. 305. n. 21.

[44] C. 24. See ch. 4. s. 4. p. 320. n. 90.

[45] Novel. 3. c. 1. (t. 5. p. 33.) Καὶ ἑκατὸν πρὸς τούτοις τῶν καλουμένων πυλωρῶν. . . . et supra centum existentibus iis, qui vocantur ostiarii. —Compare b. 2. ch. 20. s. 19. p. 270. n. 43.

[46] Archierat. part. 5. observ. 1. (p. 47.) Series igitur illa ejusmodi ordinum non omnino constans ac perpetua exstitit.

we do not find; for there is no author that speaks of it. In the Latin Church it was no more but the bishop's commission, with the ceremony of delivering the keys of the church into their hands, and saying, 'Behave thyself as one that must give an account to God of the things that are kept locked under these keys;' as the form is in the fourth Council of Carthage[47], and the *Ordo Romanus*[48], and Gratian[49], who have it from that Council.

Ordination in the Latin Church.

3. Their office is commonly said to consist in taking care of the doors of the church in time of divine service, and in making a distinction betwixt the faithful and the catechumens, and excommunicated persons, and such others as were to be excluded from the church. But I confess this is more than can be made out from ancient history, at least in reference to the state and discipline of many Churches. For in the African Church particularly, as I shall have occasion to shew in another place, a liberty was given, not only to catechumens and penitents, but also to heretics, Jews and heathens, to come to the first part of the Church's service, called the *missa catechumenorum*, that is, to hear the Scripture read, and the homily or sermon that was made upon it; because these were instructive, and might be means of their conversion, so that there was no need of making any distinction here. Then for the other part of the service, called *missa fidelium*, or the *communion-service*, the distinction that was made in that was done by the deacons or subdeacons, and deaconesses, as I have shewed before in speaking of those orders. So that all that the door-keepers could have to do in this matter was only to open and shut the doors, as officers and servants under the others, and to be governed wholly by their direction. It belonged to them likewise to give notice of the times of prayer and church-assemblies; which, in time of persecution, required a private signal, for fear of discovery: and that perhaps was the first reason of instituting this order in the Church of Rome, whose example

Their office and function.

[47] C. 9. (t. 2. p. 1200 d.) Ostiarius cum ordinatur..... ad suggestionem archidiaconi tradat ei episcopus claves ecclesiæ [de altario] dicens; Sic age quasi reddituru Deo rationem de [pro] his rebus, quæ his clavibus recluduntur.

[48] Part. 2. p. 98. (ap. Bibl. Max. t. 13. p. 704 g. 11.) Sic agite quasi reddituri Deo rationem pro his rebus, quæ istis clavibus recluduntur.

[49] Decret. part. 1. dist. 23. c. 19. (t. 1. p. 114. 68.) The same words.

by degrees was followed by other Churches. However it be, their office and station seems to have been little more than that of clerks and sextons in our modern churches.

CHAP. VII.

Of the psalmistæ or singers.

The singers distinct clergy from others in the ancient church.

1. I have hitherto given an account of those five inferior orders, which the Church of Rome has singled out from the rest, and without any reason stamped them with the authority and character of apostolical institution; whilst yet she takes no notice of some others, which have as good pretence to antiquity, and to be styled distinct clerical orders, as most of the former. Among these I reckon the *psalmistæ*, the *copiatæ*, and the *parabolani* of the primitive Church. Habertus[50] and Bellarmin[51], and others, who are concerned to maintain the credit of the Romish Church in making but five inferior orders, pretend that singers and readers are only one and the same order. But as the canonists of their own Church generally reckon them two, so nothing can be more evident than that they were always accounted so in the primitive Church from their first institution. For they are distinguished as much as any other orders by all the writers that mention them: as the reader that is curious in this matter may satisfy himself by consulting the places of Ephrem Syrus[52], the Council of Laodicea[53], and those called the Apostolical Canons[54], and Constitutions[55], the author of St. Mark's Liturgy[56], the Epistle under the name of Ignatius[57], Justinian[58], and the

[50] Archierat. part. 4. observ. 4. (p. 44.) Diversum ab lectore non constituit ordinem psaltes.

[51] De Cler. l. 1. c. 11. (t. 2. p. 358 d.) Etsi episcopus et presbyter distinguuntur, tamen quantum ad sacrificium, idem omnino ministerium exhibent, proinde unum ordinem non duo faciant, sicut etiam lector et cantor seu psalmista.

[52] Serm. 93. de Secund. Dom. Advent. [juxt. Ed. Voss. t. 3. Latine] [juxt. Ed. Assemann. Serm. Paræneticus, &c. t. 3. p. 158 a.) ... Καὶ ψάλται καὶ ἀναγνῶστται, κ. τ. λ.

[53] C. 24. See before, ch. 4. s. 4. p. 320. n. 90.

[54] C. 68. [al. 69.] See ch. 1. s. 2. p. 305. n. 19.—C. 43. [al. 41.] (Cotel. [c. 35.] v. 1. p. 443.) Ὑποδιάκονος, ἢ ψάλτης, ἢ ἀναγνώστης τὰ ὅμοια ποιῶν, ἢ παυσάσθω, ἢ ἀφοριζέσθω.

[55] L. 3. c. 11. See ch. 1. s. 2. p. 305. n. 17.

[56] Vid. ap. Bibl. Patr. Gr. Lat. (t. 2. p. 35 d. 4.) Μνήσθητι δὲ καὶ τῶν ἁπανταχοῦ ὀρθοδόξων ἐπισκόπων, πρεσβυτέρων, διακόνων, ὑποδιακόνων, ἀναγνωστῶν, ψαλτῶν, μοναζόντων, ἀεὶ παρθένων, χηρῶν, λαϊκῶν.

[57] Ep. ad Antioch. n. 12. See ch. 1. s. 2. p. 305. n. 16.

[58] Novel. 3. c. 1. (t. 5. p. 33.) ... Cantores vigintiquinque, &c.

Council of Trullo[59], referred to in the margin. Particularly Justinian's Novel does so distinguish them, as to inform us that there were twenty-five singers and one hundred and ten readers in the Greek Church of Constantinople; which is a convincing evidence that they were of different orders.

Their institution and office.

2. The first rise and institution of these singers, as an order of the clergy, seems to have been about the beginning of the fourth century. For the Council of Laodicea is the first that mentions them, unless any one thinks perhaps the Apostolical Canons to be a little more ancient. The reason of instituting them seems to have been to regulate and encourage the ancient psalmody of the Church. For from the first and apostolical age singing was always a part of divine service, in which the whole body of the Church joined together: which is a thing so evident, that though Cabassutius[60] denies it, and in his spite to the Reformed Churches, where it is generally practised, calls it only *a Protestant whim;* yet Cardinal Bona has more than once[61] not only confessed, but solidly proved it to have been the primitive practice. Of which therefore I shall say no more at present, but only observe, that it was the decay of this that first brought the order of singers into the Church. For when it was found by experience that the negligence and unskilfulness of the people rendered them unfit to perform this service, without some more curious and skilful to guide and assist them; then a peculiar order of men were appointed and set over this business, with a design to retrieve and improve the ancient psalmody, and not to abolish or destroy it. And from this time these were called *κανονικοὶ ψαλταὶ, the canonical singers,* that is, such as were entered into the canon or cata-

[59] C. 4. (t. 6. p. 1143 c.) Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, ἢ διάκονος, ἢ ὑποδιάκονος, ἢ ἀναγνώστης, ἢ ψάλτης, ἢ θυρωρὸς, γυναικὶ ἀφιερωμένῃ [τῷ] Θεῷ μιχθείῃ, καθαιρείσθω, κ.τ.λ.

[60] Notit. Concil. c. 38. [28?] p. 201. Lugdun. 1670. 8vo. [This book I cannot find; and the folio edition of 1685 does not contain the passage. See Ed. Venet. 1703. 8vo. (p. 339.) Canon Laodic. 15. declarat, non alias licere intra ecclesiam canere, quam canonicis cantoribus, qui ambonem conscendunt et de membranis legunt.... Quam sunt ergo veteris ecclesiæ disciplinæ dissentanei Calvinistarum profani conventus, in quibus laici omnes viri et feminæ promiscue cantant. Ed.]

[61] Rer. Liturg. l. 1. c. 25. n. 19. (p. 268.) A primordiis ecclesiæ psalmos et hymnos in conventu fidelium decantatos fuisse, Apostolus asserit ad Ephes. scribens c. 5, &c. —De Divin. Psalmod. c. 17. s. 2. n. 3. (p. 476.) Ab ipso Domino et ab Apostolis, ait Augustinus, psalmos et hymnos canendi habemus documenta, et exempla, et præcepta.

logue of the clergy, which distinguish them from the body of the Church. In some places it was thought fit for some time to prohibit all others from singing but only these; with design, no doubt, to restore the concert of the ancient ecclesiastical harmony; which otherwise could not well have been done, but by obliging the rest for some time to be silent, and learn of those who were more skilful in the art of music. Thus I understand that canon of the Council of Laodicea[62], which forbids all others to sing in the church, except only the canonical singers, who went up into the *ambo* or *singing-desk* and sung out of a book. This was a temporary provision, designed only to restore and revive the ancient psalmody, by reducing it to its primitive harmony and perfection. That which the rather inclines me to put this sense upon the canon, and look upon it only as a prohibition for a time, is, that in after-ages we find the people enjoyed their ancient privilege of singing all together; which is frequently mentioned by St. Austin, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Basil, and many others, who give an account of the psalmody and service of the Church in their own ages; of which I shall speak more hereafter in its proper place.

Why called ὑποβολεῖς.

3. Here I must note, that these canonical singers were also called *ὑποβολεῖς*, *monitors* or *suggestors*, from their office, which was to be a sort of precentors to the people; for the custom in some places was for the singer or psalmist to begin a psalm or hymn and sing half a verse by himself, and then the people answered in the latter clause; and from this they were said *ὑπηχεῖν* or *succinere, to sing after him*, by way of *antiphona* or *responsal*. In this sense Epiphanius Scholasticus understands the name *ὑποβολεῖς* in Socrates[63], for he translates it *psalmi pronunciatores;* and so both Valesius[64] and Cotele-

[62] C. 15. (t. 1. p. 1500 a.) Περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν πλέον τῶν κανονικῶν ψαλτῶν τῶν ἐπὶ τὸν ἄμβωνα ἀναβαινόντων, καὶ ἀπὸ διφθέρας ψαλλόντων, ἑτέρους τινὰς ψάλλειν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ.

[63] L. 5. c. 22. See before, ch. 5. s. 3. p. 327. n. 27.

[64] In Socrat. loc. cit. (v. 2. p. 296. n. 1.) Pessime Musculus et Christophorsonus verterunt *interpretes*. Optime vero Epiphanius exposuit *psalmi pronuntiatores*. Horum munus videtur fuisse, prima psalmi verba præcinere. Populus deinde reliqua succinebat. Ὑποβολεῖς dicebantur olim monitores, qui in scena monebant histriones, ut docet Festus. Hi suggerebant actoribus, quoties memoria eos deficiebant... Erant et monitores in precationibus, quorum meminit Tertullianus in Apologetico, ubi dicit Christianos sine monitore orasse, quia de pectore orabant.

rius[65] explain it. But Habertus[66] is of the contrary mind. He thinks the name ὑποβολεῖς denotes not singers, but *readers;* and that they were so called, because they *suggested* to the preachers a portion of Scripture to discourse upon: for then their homilies were frequently upon such parts of Scripture as the reader had just before repeated. The controversy is nice betwixt these learned men, and I shall no further inquire into the merits of it, but leave it to every judicious reader to determine.

What sort of ordination they had.

4. There is but one thing more that needs be noted concerning this order, which is the manner of their designation to this office; which in this agreed with all the other inferior orders, that it required no imposition of hands or solemn consecration. But in one thing it differed from them;—that, whereas the rest were usually conferred by the bishop or a *chorepiscopus,* this might be conferred by a presbyter, using this form of words, as it is in the canon of the fourth Council of Carthage[67]: 'See that thou believe in thy heart what thou singest with thy mouth, and approve in thy works what thou believest in thy heart.' And this is all the ceremony we find any where used about their designation.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the copiatæ or fossarii.

The *copiatæ* or *fossarii* reckoned among the *clerici* of the primitive Church.

1. Another order of the inferior clergy in the primitive Church were those, whose business was to take care of funerals and provide for the decent interment of the dead. These in ancient writers are commonly termed *copiatæ,* which is the name that Constantius gives them in two Rescripts in the

[65] Not. in Constit. Apost. l. 2. c. 57. (v. 1. p. 262. n. 34.) .... Præcinebant cantores, populus vero succinebat. Qui psaltæ ideo in Socratis Historia Ecclesiastica (l. 5. c. 22.) appellantur ὑποβολεῖς, *monitores, suggestores, psalmi pronuntiatores ac prænuntiatores,* quemadmodum docuit magnus interpres.

[66] Archierat. part. 4. observ. 1. (p. 39.) .... Conjicio igitur lectores ὑποβολεῖς dici, quasi *subjectores* vel *suggestores,* non vero cantores, quod docto theologo placuit.

[67] C. 10. (t. 2. p. 1200 e.) Psalmista, id est, cantor potest absque scientia episcopi, sola jussione presbyteri, officium suscipere cantandi, dicente sibi presbytero: Vide ut, quod ore cantas, corde credas: et, quod corde credis, operibus comprobes.

Theodosian Code[68]. Epiphanius[69] speaks of them under the same name, styling them κοπιάται, and the author under the name of Ignatius[70] κοπιῶντες. Gothofred[71] deduces it from the Greek word κοπάζειν, which signifies *resting;* others from κοπετὸς, *mourning;* but generally the name is thought to be given them from κόπος and κοπιᾶσθαι, which signify *labouring*, whence they are by some called *laborantes*. The author under the name of St. Jerom[72] styles them *fossarii*, from *digging of graves;* and in Justinian's Novels[73] they are called *lecticarii*, from *carrying the corps* or *bier* at funerals. Gothofred thinks it improper to reckon these among the *clerici*[74] of the ancient Church. But when we are speaking of things and customs of the ancient Church, I know not how we shall speak more properly than in the language of the ancients, who themselves call them so. For not only the author under the name of St. Jerom[75] calls them the first order of the *clerici*, as they are in his account, but St. Jerom himself also gives them the same title; speaking of one that was to be interred,

[68] L. 13. tit. 1. de Lustrali Conlatione, leg. 1. (t. 5. p. 3.) Negotiatores omnes protinus convenit aurum argentumque præbere: clericos excipi tantum, qui copiatæ appellantur, nec alium quemquam esse immunem ab hujus conlationis obsequio.—L. 16. tit. 2. de Episcopis, &c., leg. 15. (t. 6. p. 42.) Clerici vero vel hi quos copiatas recens usus instituit nuncupari, ita a sordidis muneribus debent immunes, atque a conlatione præstari, si exiguis admodum mercimoniis tenuem sibi victum vestitumque conquirent.

[69] Expos. Fid. n. 21. See ch. 1. s. 2. p. 305. n. 21.

[70] Ep. ad Antioch. n. 12. See ibid. n. 16.

[71] In Cod. Theod. l. 13. tit. 1. leg. 1. (t. 5. p. 5.) Porro dicti *copiatæ* communi sententia hactenus, tanquam si diceres *operarios*, *laboratores*, ἀπὸ τοῦ κόπου καὶ κοπιᾶσθαι. Ego non minus quoque malim, ἀπὸ τῆς κοπίας seu κοπάζειν, quod significat *quietem* et *quiescere*.

[72] De Sept. Ord. Eccles. t. 4. p. 81. See ch. 1. s. 2. p. 305. n. 20.

[73] Novel. 43. Præf. (t. 5. p. 256.) Et quia tam divæ memoriæ Constantinus, amplæ hujus nostræ urbis conditor, quam etiam pientissimus princeps Anastasius, lecticariorum, seu decanorum, ut vocat, numerum ad certam mensuram redegerunt, mille et centum tantummodo decani, totidemque officinis definitis, ut nullo hæ unquam tempore augmentum reciperent: propterea sane cupientes, ut numerus eorum, quos ex unoquoque collegio convenit esse lecticarios divæ memoriæ Anastasii formulæ subjaceat, firma ea, et fixa manere voluimus.—Novel. 59. Præf. (t. 5. p. 300.) Anastasio vero piæ memoriæ non solum ergasteriis illis quinquaginta et centum adjiciente; sed et redditum certum largiente per duas pragmaticas formas, ... neque sine mercede fieri defunctorum exequias; &c.

[74] In Cod. Theod. l. 16. tit. 2. leg. 15. (t. 6. p. 43.) .... De *copiatis* observandum .... eos separari hac lege a clericis, cum tamen alias clericorum numero censeantur.

[75] See n. 72, preceding.

'The *clerici*,' says he[76], 'whose office it was, wound up the body, digged the earth, builded a vault, and so, according to custom, made ready the grave.' This is the reason why Epiphanius and the counterfeit Ignatius[77] reckon them among the inferior orders. And Gothofred had no need to make emendations upon those imperial laws in the Theodosian Code[78], which give the *copiatæ* the name of *clerici*, and entitle them to some immunities and privileges upon that account; for this, as appears, was only to speak in the language and style of other ecclesiastical writers.

First instituted in the time of Constantine.

2. This order seems to have been first instituted in the time of Constantine: for Constantius, his son, in one of those laws just now referred to, speaks of it as a late institution, and there is no writer of the three first ages that ever mentions it; but all that time the care of interring the dead was only a charitable office, which every Christian thought himself obliged to perform as occasion required. And that is the reason why we meet with so many noble encomiums of this sort of charity in the writers of those ages, but never once mention of any order instituted for that purpose. But when Constantine came to the throne, and was quietly settled in his new seat at Constantinople, he incorporated a body of men, to the number of eleven hundred, in that city, under the name of *copiatæ*, for that particular service; and so they continued to the time of Honorius and Theodosius Junior, who reduced them[79] to nine hundred and fifty. But Anastasius augmented them again to the first number, which Justinian confirmed by two Novels[80] published for that purpose. And I suppose from this example of the Constantinopolitan Church they took their rise in other populous Churches.

[76] Ep. [1.] ad Innocent. de Muliere septies icta, t. 1. p. 235. (t. 1. p. 6 d.) Clerici, quibus id officii erat, cruentum linteo cadaver obvolvunt, et, fossam humum lapidibus construentes, ex more tumulum parant.

[77] See ch. 1. s. 2. p. 305. nn. 21 & 16.

[78] L. 7. tit. 20. de Veteranis, leg. 12. (t. 2. p. 434.) Dum se quidam vocabulo clericorum, et infaustis defunctorum obsequiis occupatos .... defendunt, &c.—L. 13. tit. 1. de Lustrali Collatione, leg. 1. (t. 5. p. 3.) .... Clericos excipi tantum, qui *copiatæ* appellantur, &c.—L. 16. tit. 2. de Episcopis, leg. 15. (t. 6. p. 42.) Clerici vero, vel hi, quos *copiatas* recens usus instituit nuncupari, &c.

[79] Ap. Cod. Justin. l. 1. tit. 2. de SS. Ecclesiis, leg. 4. (t. 4. p. 33.) Non plures, quam nongenti quinquaginta decani sacrosanctæ hujus amplissimæ urbis deputentur ecclesiæ.

[80] See n. 73, preceding.

Why called decani and collegiati.

3. But probably there might be some little difference between those in the Church of Constantinople and others in the lesser Churches. For at Constantinople they were incorporated into a sort of civil society, in the Roman language called *collegium, a college;* whence the laws sometimes styled them *collegiati* and *decani, collegiates* and *deans.* As in the forementioned laws of Honorius and Theodosius Junior, and Justinian, and another of Theodosius the Great in the Justinian Code[81], where he grants them an exemption from some other civil offices; provided they did not act upon a feigned and pretended title, but were really employed in the service of the Church. But why they were called *decani,* is not very easy to conjecture. Probably it might be, because they resembled the palatine deans, who were a sort of military officers belonging to the emperor's palace, and are styled also *corpus decanorum* in both the Codes[82] mentioned by St. Chrysostom[83], and other Greek writers, under the name of *δεκανοὶ ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις, deans of the palace,* to distinguish them from those other deans of the church, which some unwarily confound together. But I am not very confident that this was the reason of the name, and therefore I only propose it as a conjecture, till some one assigns a better reason for it.

Their office and privileges.

4. Their office was to take the whole care of funerals upon themselves, and to see that all persons had a decent and honourable interment. Especially they were obliged to perform this last office to the poorer sort, without exacting anything of their relations upon that account. That it was so at Constantinople, appears from one of Justinian's Novels[84], which acquaints us how Anastasius, the emperor, settled certain reve-

[81] L. 11. tit. 17. de Collegiatis, leg. unic. (t. 5. p. 143.) Qui sub prætextu decanorum seu collegiatorum, cum id munus non impleant, aliis se muneribus conantur subtrahere, eorum fraudibus credimus esse obviandum.

[82] L. 6. tit. 33. de Decanis, leg. 1. (t. 2. p. 232.) ... Qui ex corpore decanorum ad primum militiæ gradum pervenerint, biennii spatio primiceriatus gerant officium, &c.—L. 12. tit. 27. leg. 1. (t. 5. p. 279.) Quatuor [alias incipit, Qui, &c.] qui ex corpore decanorum, &c.—Ibid. leg. 2. (ad calc. paginæ.) Nostræ pietatis famulationibus adhærentes decanos non oportet pro desiderio pulsantium ad alia pertrahi judicia, &c.

[83] Hom. 13. in Hebr. p. 1849. (t. 12. p. 137 c.) *Εἰ γὰρ ἐνταῦθα καὶ ὁ ὕπαρχος, καὶ πάντες οἱ περὶ τὸν βασιλέα, καὶ οἱ σφόδρα καταδεέστεροι, καὶ τὸν τῶν λεγομένων δεκανῶν τόπον ἐπέχοντες ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις εἰσὶ, καί τοι τοσούτου ὄντος τοῦ μέσου τοῦ ὑπάρχου καὶ τοῦ δεκανοῦ· πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἐν τοῖς ἄνω βασιλείοις τοῦτο ἔσται.*

[84] Novel. 59. See s. 1. latter part of n. 73, preceding.

nues of land upon this society, and ordered a certain number of shops or workhouses in the city to be freed from all manner of tribute, and to be appropriated to this use; out of whose income and annual rents of the lands, the defensors and stewards of the Church, who had the chief care and oversight of the matter, were to pay these deans, and see the expenses of such funerals defrayed. Justinian not only confirmed that settlement, but a complaint being made of an abuse,—that notwithstanding the laws of Anastasius, pay was exacted for funerals, —he published that, his Novel, on purpose to correct it. But we do not find that such settlements were made in all other Churches: but it is more probable that the *copiatæ* were maintained partly out of the common stock of the Church, and partly out of their own labour and traffic, which, for their encouragement, was generally exempted from paying custom or tribute, as we shall see hereafter.

CHAP. IX.

Of the parabolani.

The *parabolani* ranked by some among the *clerici*.

1. Another order of men, which by some are reckoned among the *clerici* of the ancient Church, were those whom they called *parabolani*. Theodosius Junior, in one of his laws relating to them in the Theodosian Code[85], puts them among the *clerici*, and evidently includes them under that common title, as Gothofred rightly observes in his exposition of the place. Baronius himself does not deny that they were of the clergy, but he would persuade his reader that they were not a distinct order, but chosen out of the inferior orders of the clergy[86]; of which there is nothing said in that law, but rather the contrary, that they were to be chosen out of the poor of Alexandria.

Their institution and office.

2. Their office is described in the next law, where they are

[85] L. 16. tit. 2. de Episcopis, leg. 42. (t. 6. p. 82.) Quia inter cætera Alexandrinæ legationis inutilia, hoc etiam decretis scriptum est, Ut reverendissimus episcopus de Alexandrina civitate aliquos non exire, (quod quidem terrore eorum, qui parabalani nuncupantur, legationi insertum est,) placet nostræ clementiæ, ut nihil commune clerici cum publicis actibus vel ad curiam pertinentibus habeant.—Gothofr. Not. in loc. (ibid. p. 83.) Sane clericorum eos numero fuisse, tum hujus legis initium, tum utraque hæc lex et sequens .... ostendunt.

[86] An. 416. (t. 5. p. 406 d.) ... Fuisse .... hos minoris ordinis clericos allectos, exordium dati hoc anno rescripti insinuare videtur.

said to be deputed to attend upon the sick, and to take care of their bodies in time of their weakness[87]. At Alexandria they were incorporated into a society to the number of five or six hundred, to be chosen, at the discretion of the bishop of the place, out of any sort of men except the *honorati* and *curiales*, who were tied to serve in the civil offices of their country, and therefore were not allowed to enter themselves into any ecclesiastical service. They were to be under the government and direction of the bishop, as appears from the same law, which is a correction of the former law; for by it they were put under the government of the *Præfectus Augustalis*, as the chief civil magistrate was called at Alexandria. But by this law Theodosius revoked his former decree, and subjected them entirely to the care and disposition of the bishop, or, as the Greek collector of the Ecclesiastical Constitutions out of the Civil Law[88] styles him, the pope; meaning, not the Pope of Rome, as some ignorantly mistake, but the pope or bishop of Alexandria: for then it was customary to give every bishop the name of *papa*, as has been shewed in another place[89]. What time this order began, we cannot certainly determine. The first notice we have of it is in these laws of Theodosius Junior, anno 415. Yet it is not there spoken of as newly instituted, but as settled in the Church before; and probably it might be instituted about the same time as the *copiatæ* were under Constantine; when some charitable offices, which were only voluntarily practised by Christians before, as every one's piety inclined him, were now turned into standing offices, and settled upon a certain order of men particularly devoted to such services. That it was not any order peculiar to the Church of Alexandria is evident, because there is mention made of the *parabalani* being at Ephesus in the time of the second Council, that was held there anno 449. For Basilius Seleuciensis, who subscribed there to the condemnation of Flavian and the absolution of Eutyches the here-

[87] Vid. Cod. Theod. ibid. leg. 43. (t. 6. p. 85.) Parabolani, [al. parabalani,] qui ad curanda debilium ægra corpora deputantur, quingentos esse ante præcepimus: sed quia hos minus sufficere in præsenti cognovimus, pro quingentis sexcentos constitui præcipimus, &c.

[88] Collect. Constit. Eccles. l. 1. tit. 3. c. 18. (ap. Justel. Bibl. Jur. Canon. t. 2. p. 1255.) Παραβαλάνιν [corrige, παραβαλανεῖς] γίνονται καὶ κατὰ δοκιμασίαν τοῦ ἐπισκόπου Ἀλεξανδρείας· μὴ ὄντες ἀξιωματικοὶ καὶ βουλευταὶ, ὀφείλοντες ἐπιμελεῖσθαι τῶν λελωβημένων καὶ ταῖς κελεύσεσι τοῦ πάπα πειθαρχεῖν.

[89] B. 2. c. 2. s. 7. v. 1. p. 65.

tic, being brought to a recantation in the Council of Chalcedon, makes this apology for himself: 'that he was terrified into that subscription by the soldiers that came armed into the church, together with Barsumus and his monks, and the *parabalani*[90], and a great multitude of others.' The original word is παραβαλανεῖς, which the old translator rightly renders *parabalani*, which is the same with *parabolani*, for it is written both ways in ancient authors. But Binius[91] in his Greek edition of the Councils, not understanding the word, explains it by *ii qui circa balnea versantur*, as if the *parabalani* had been *persons attending at the public baths:* whereas now all men know their office was of a different nature, and their names given them for a reason very different from that of giving attendance at the baths.

The reason of the name *parabolani*.

3. As to the reason of their name, to omit the fanciful interpretations of Alciat and Accursius, which are sufficiently exposed by Gothofred, the opinion of Duarenus[92] and Gothofred seems to be the truest, that they were called *parabolani* from their undertaking παράβολον ἔργον, *a most dangerous and hazardous office*, in attending the sick, especially in infectious and pestilential diseases. The Greeks were used to call those παράβολοι who hired themselves out to fight with wild beasts in the amphitheatre: and so Socrates, the historian[93], uses the word. Speaking of Theodosius's exhibiting one of the public games to the people at Constantinople, he says, 'the people cried out to him that he should suffer one of the bold παράβολοι to fight with the wild beasts.' These were those whom the Romans called *bestiarii*, and sometimes *paraboli* and *parabolarii*, from the Greek word παραβάλλεσθαι, which signifies *exposing a man's life to danger*, as they that fought with

[90] Act. 1. (t. 4. p. 251 b.) Εἰσέτρεχον γὰρ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν στρατιῶται μετὰ ὅπλων, καὶ εἱστήκεισαν οἱ μονάζοντες μετὰ Βαρσουμᾶ, καὶ οἱ παραβαλανεῖς, καὶ πλῆθος ἄλλο πολύ· κ. τ. λ.—[N. B. The number of the page is incorrect, 251 and the following occurring before. This reference is according to the second place where the paginal numbers recommence. Ed.]

[91] [Vid. ibid. Marg.]

[92] De Minist. et Benefic. l. 1. c. 19. (fol. 22. verb. ult.) Parabolani ideo fortassis dicebantur, quia παράβολον ἔργον, rem periculi et discriminis plenam, tractabant. [See b. 1. ch. 2. s. 9. p. 21. n. 8; where I have given an extract from Suicer, Thes. Eccles. in voce, παραβολάνοι. Ed.]

[93] L. 7. c. 22. (v. 2. p. 369. 35.) .... Ὁ δῆμος κατεβόα, δεινῷ θηρίῳ ἕνα τῶν εὐφυῶν παραβόλων μάχεσθαι.

wild beasts did. In this sense, I have had occasion to shew before[94], the Christians were generally called *parabolarii* by the heathens, because they were so ready to expose their lives to martyrdom. And it is the opinion of Gothofred[95], and some other learned critics[96], that the ancient reading of the Greek copies of St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, chap. ii. ver. 30, was παραβολευσάμενος τῇ ψυχῇ, *exposing his life to danger*, as an old Latin interpreter of Puteanus renders it, *parabolatus de anima sua*. In the same sense these *parabolani* of the primitive Church we are now speaking of had their name from their boldly exposing their lives to danger in attendance upon the sick in all infectious and pestilential distempers.

Some laws and rules concerning their behaviour.

4. I shall only observe further of them, that being commonly, according to their name, men of a bold and daring spirit, they were ready upon all occasions to engage in any quarrel that should happen in Church or State: as they seem to have done in the dispute between Cyril the bishop and Orestes the governor of Alexandria; which was the reason why Theodosius, by his first law, sunk their number to five hundred, and put them under the inspection of the *Præfectus*

[94] B. 1. ch. 2. s. 9. v. 1. p. 20.

[95] Not. in Cod. Theod. l. 16. tit. 2. de Episcopis, leg. 42. (t. 6. p. 83. ad calc. col. sinistr.) . . . . . Apostolus, 2 Philipp. ultim., διὰ τὸ ἔργον τοῦ Χριστοῦ μέχρι θανάτου ἤγγισε παραβολευσάμενος τῇ ψυχῇ, ubi vetustissimus etiam interpres, qui apud clarissimos mihique conjunctissimos fratres Puteanos optimæ notæ, *parabolatus de anima sua*, vertit: et male qui in παραβουλευσάμενος id vertunt. Et rursum: παραβουλευσάμενος, ad locum Pauli respiciens, εἰς θάνατον δοντὰν ἐκδοὺς: sed ibi restituendum, παραβολευσάμενος: in veteri glossario, *desperatus*, παράβολος: item παραβόλον, παρείδαξον. Denique παραβολεύσασθαι idem est quod ῥιψοκινδυνεύειν: Glossæ Philoxeni, παραβολεύσασθαι, *periculum facere*. Valeant itaque jam Accursii nugæ, *nasorentis medicos contemptim parabolanos* vocari solitos, eo quod multas haberent parabolas, quodque ut quisque loquacior est, ita et doctior medicus vulgi sententia et opinione existimetur. Immo valeant etiam Alciati deducentis a voce παρὰ et βῶλος, quasi *glebæ adscriptos* dicas.

[96] Grotius, in Phil. 2, 30. (t. 2. v. 2. p. 915. 10.) Omnino legendum est παραβολευσάμενος τῇ ψυχῇ, id est, *vitam objectans periculis*, quomodo viri magni Scaliger et Salmasius monuere. Plinius in Epistolis, *periculosa, utque Græci melius exponunt* παράβολα. Latinus interpres recepto vetustior posuerat hic, *parabolatus est animam suam*. Nam et Latine *parabolani* dicuntur, qui cum vitæ periculo ægrotis adsunt. — Hammond, on the same passage. (v. 3. p. 642.) The word παραβουλευσάμενος is not ordinarily to be met with unless in Hesychius, and Phavorinus, and other Glossaries. . It is probable that the reading here should be παραβολευσάμενος: so παράβολος, in Aristophanes, is ῥιψοκίνδυνος, *he that casts himself into danger*. [Cf. Xenoph. Memor. l. 1. c. 3 . . . . Ἀνοήτων τε καὶ ῥιψοκινδύνων. Ed.]

Augustalis, and strictly prohibited them from appearing at any public shows, or in the common council of the city, or in the judge's court, unless any of them had a cause of his own, or of the whole body, as their syndic, to prosecute there; and then he must appear single without any of his order or associates to abet him. And though he not long after revoked this law as to the former part, allowing them to be six hundred, and the bishop to have the choice and cognizance of them, yet in all other respects he ordered it to stand in its full force, still prohibiting them to appear in a body upon any of the foresaid[97] occasions. And Justinian made this law perpetual by inserting it into his own Code; which shews that the civil government always looked upon these *parabolani* as a formidable body of men, and accordingly kept a watchful eye and strict hand over them: that whilst they were serving the Church they might not do any disservice to the State, but keep within the bounds of that office, whereto they were appointed.

CHAP. X.

Of the catechist.

Catechists no distinct order of the clergy, but chosen out of any other order.

1. I have hitherto discoursed of such particular orders of the ecclesiastics in the primitive Church as were destinated precisely to some particular office and function: but there were some offices which did not require a man to be of any one distinct order, but might be performed by persons of any order; and it will be necessary I should give some account of these also, whilst I am treating of the clergy of the Church. The first of these I shall speak of is *the catechist*, whose office was to instruct the catechumens in the first principles of religion, and thereby prepare them for the reception of baptism. This office was sometimes done by the bishop himself, as is evident from that passage in St. Ambrose, where he says[98], 'upon a certain Lord's-day, after the reading the Scriptures and the

[97] Vid. Cod. Justin. l. i. tit. 3. de Episc. leg. 18. (t. 4. p. 82. ad calc.) .... Ita ut hi sexcenti viri reverendissimi sacerdotis præceptis ac dispositionibus obsecundent; .... reliquis, quæ dudum latæ legis forma complectitur super his parabolanis, vel de spectaculis, vel de judiciis, cæterisque, sicut jam statutum est, custodiendis.

[98] Ep. 33. [al. 20.] ad Marcellin. (t. 2. p. 853 b. n. 4.) Post lectiones atque tractatum, dimissis catechumenis, symbolum aliquibus competentibus in baptisteriis tradebam basilicæ.

sermon, when the catechumens were dismissed, he took the *competentes*, or *candidates for baptism*, into the baptistery of the church, and there rehearsed the creed to them.' This was on Palm-Sunday, when it was customary for the bishop himself to catechise such of the catechumens as were to be baptized on Easter-Eve. Theodorus Lector[99] takes notice of the same custom in the Eastern Churches, when he tells us, 'that before the time of Timothy, bishop of Constantinople, the Nicene Creed was never used to be repeated publicly in that Church, except only once a year, on the great day of preparation, the day of our Lord's passion, when the bishop was wont to catechise.' At other times presbyters and deacons were the catechists. St. Chrysostom performed this office when he was presbyter of Antioch, as appears from one of his Homilies[1], which is inscribed, Κατήχησις πρὸς τοὺς μέλλοντας φωτίζεσθαι, *A catechism* or *instruction for the candidates of baptism.* Deogratias was catechist when he was deacon of Carthage, as we learn from St. Austin's book[2], *De Catechizandis Rudibus*, which he wrote at his request, to give him some assistance in performing his duty.

2. Nor was it only the superior orders that performed this office; but sometimes persons were chosen out of the inferior orders to do it. Optatus was but a reader in the Church of Carthage, and yet Cyprian made him catechist, or, as it is in his phrase[3], *doctor audientium*, *the master of the hearers*, or lowest rank of catechumens. Origen seems to have had no higher degree in the Church when he was first made catechist at Alexandria; for both Eusebius[4] and St. Jerom[5] say he was

[99] Collect. l. 2. p. 563. (v. 3. p. 578. 17.) Τιμόθεος τὸ τῶν τριακοσίων δέκα καὶ ὀκτὼ πατέρων τῆς πίστεως σύμβολον, καθ' ἑκάστην σύναξιν λέγεσθαι παρεσκεύασεν, ἐπὶ διαβολῇ δηθεν Μακεδονίου, ὡς αὐτοῦ μὴ δεχομένου τὸ σύμβολον, ἅπαξ τοῦ ἔτους λεγόμενον πρότερον ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ παρασκευῇ τοῦ θείου πάθους, τῷ καιρῷ τῶν γινομένων ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου κατηχήσεων.

[1] Hom. 21. ad Pop. Antioch. (t. 2. p. 234.) Κατήχησις β., κ. τ. λ.

[2] De Catechiz. Rud. c. 1. t. 4. p. 295. (t. 6. p. 263 a.) Dixisti enim quod sæpe apud Carthaginem, ubi diaconus es, ad te adducuntur, qui fide Christiana primitus imbuendi sunt, &c.

[3] Ep. 24. [al. 29.] (p. 209.) Optatum inter lectores doctorem audientium constituimus.

[4] L. 11. c. 3. (v. 1. p. 260. 15.) Ἔτος δ' ἦγεν ὀκτωκαιδέκατον, καθ' ὃ τοῦ τῆς κατηχήσεως προέστη διδασκαλείου.

[5] De Scriptor. Eccles. in Origene. [c. 54.] (t. 2. p. 877.) Decimo octavo ætatis suæ anno κατηχήσεων opus aggressus, &c.

but eighteen years old when he was deputed to that office; which was at least seven years before he could be ordained deacon by the canons of the Church.

Why called *ναυτολόγοι* by some Greek writers.

3. The author under the name of Clemens Romanus seems to have had regard to this when comparing the Church to a ship, and the clergy to the officers in it, he plainly distinguishes the catechists from the bishop, presbyters, and deacons, saying[6], 'the bishop is to resemble the *πρωρεὺς*, or *pilot;* the presbyters the *ναῦται*, or *mariners;* the deacons the *τοίχαρχοι*, or *chief rowers;* the catechists the *ναυτολόγοι*, or those whose office it was to admit passengers into the ship, and contract with them for *the fare of their passage.*' This was properly the catechist's duty, to shew the catechumens the contract they were to make, and the conditions they were to perform, viz. repentance, faith, and new obedience, in order to their admittance into the Christian ship, the Church, in which they were to pass through this world to the kingdom of Heaven. Upon this account the catechists were termed *ναυτολόγοι*, and as such distinguished from bishops, presbyters, and deacons. Cotelerius[7] says he found a Greek MS. in one of the French king's libraries, where the same comparison is made, and cited out of the Constitutions, in these words: 'The Church is like a ship; Christ is the governor; the bishop, the pilot; the presbyters, the mariners; the deacons, the chief rowers; the catechists, or *nautologi*, the orders of subdeacons and readers.' So that it is evident the catechists were sometimes chosen out of the inferior orders, when any of them were found duly qualified to discharge the duties of that function. And this will be the less wondered at by any one that considers that the deaconesses, whilst their order was in being, were required to be a sort

[6] Ep. ad Jacob. n. 14. (Cotel. v. 1. p. 609.) *Παρεικάσθω .... ὁ πρωρεὺς ἐπισκόπῳ, οἱ ναῦται πρεσβυτέροις, οἱ τοίχαρχοι διακόνοις, οἱ ναυστολόγοι τοῖς κατηχοῦσιν.*

[7] Not. in Constit. Apost. l. 2. c. 57. (v. 1. p. 263. n. 40.) Erant *ναυστολόγοι* seu *ναυτολόγοι*, qui, in prora constituti, tum navem intrantes recipiebant, tum vero cum navigaturis de futuro itinere colloquebantur, de naulo paciscebantur ..... Quocirca naustologos referunt partim janitores, ratione videlicet primi nautologorum officii; partim catechistæ, ratione posterioris. Quam secundam comparationem videre est inferius Epistola dicta Clementis ad Jacobum, cap. 14 et 15. In MS. Regio 2392. hæc nactus sum *Ἐκ τῶν διατάξεων· Ὅτι ἔοικεν ἡ ἐκκλησία νηΐ· ὁ μὲν κυβερνήτης ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστός· ὁ δὲ πρωρεὺς, ὁ ἐπίσκοπος· οἱ ναῦται, οἱ πρεσβύτεροι· οἱ τοίχαρχοι, οἱ διάκονοι· οἱ ναυτολόγοι, τὸ τῶν ἀναγνωστῶν καὶ ὑπηρετῶν τάγμα.*

of private catechists to the more ignorant and rustic women catechumens: which I need not stand to evince here, because I have done it heretofore[8] in speaking of the offices which belonged to that order.

Catechetical catechists might publicly in the church.

4. But in all these cases there is one thing to be diligently noted.—that this sort of catechists were not allowed to instruct their catechumens publicly in the church, but only in private auditories appointed particularly for that purpose. Valesius[9] observes this in the case of Origen, and rightly concludes it from the Invective of Demetrius, bishop of Alexandria, against Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem, and Theoctistus, bishop of Cæsarea, who had authorized Origen to preach publicly in the church, when as yet he was no presbyter. This accusation had been ridiculous had he himself given Origen the same power before, when he was catechist at eighteen years of age at Alexandria. Ruffin, indeed, in his translation of Eusebius, says positively, 'that Demetrius gave him authority to catechise and teach publicly in the church[10].' But that is an interpolation and false paraphrase of Eusebius's words, who says no such thing, but only[11], 'that Demetrius, bishop of the church, had committed to his care the office of catechising,' or, as we may render it, 'the catechetic school,' where probably for some time he also taught grammar and other human learning. That there were such sort of catechetic schools adjoining to the church in many places, is evident from a Novel of the emperor Leo[12], who calls them *κατηχούμενα*, and says, 'they

[8] B. 2. ch. 22. s. 9. v. 1. p. 295.

[9] In Euseb. l. 6. c. 19. ad verba, *ἐπὶ τοῦ καινοῦ τῆς ἐκκλησίας*. (v. 1. p. 283. n. 3.) Hinc colligitur Origenem, qui catechetes fuerat Alexandriæ, in privato auditorio, non autem in ecclesia, catechumenos instituisse. Neque enim Alexandro et Theoctisto episcopis id objiceret, si Alexandriæ idem ab Origene factum fuisset.—Cf. Hallier, de Hierarch. Eccles. l. 1. c. 7.

[10] L. 6. c. 3. (p. 132 b. 1.) ..... Videns Demetrius episcopus, quod ad ipsum præcipue, doctrinæ gratia et prædicationis Verbi Dei, multitudines plurimæ convolarent, catechizandi, id est, docendi magisterium in ecclesia tribuit.

[11] L. 6. c. 3. (v. 1. p. 261. 14.) *Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἑώρα φοιτητὰς ἤδη πλείους προσίοντας, αὐτῷ μόνῳ τῆς τοῦ κατηχεῖν διατριβῆς ὑπὸ Δημητρίου τοῦ τῆς ἐκκλησίας προεστῶτος ἐπιτετραμμένης, κ. τ. λ.*

[12] Novel. 73. (ad calc. Corp. Jur. Civ. Amstel. 1663. t. 2. p. 264.) ... In ecclesiarum cænaculis, quæ promiscuum vulgus *κατηχούμενα* vocare solet, &c.—Conf. C. Trull. c. 97. (t. 6. p. 1183 c.) *Τοὺς ... ἀδιακρίτως τοὺς ἱεροὺς τόπους κοινοποιοῦντας ... ἐκ τῶν ἐν τοῖς σεβασμίοις ναοῖς κατηχουμένων προστάσσομεν ἐξωθεῖσθαι.* —Balsamon, ad loc. (ap. Bevereg. t. 1. p. 274 e.) *Ἱεροὶ τόποι λέγονται οἱ ἀφωρισμένοι τῷ Θεῷ, ἤγουν οἱ θεῖοι ναοὶ, οἱ πρόναοι, τὰ κατηχουμε-*

were a sort of buildings belonging to the church.' It might be the baptistery, as St. Ambrose calls it, or any other places set apart for that purpose.

Of the succession in the catechetic school at Alexandria.

5. Such a school as this we may suppose that to have been, wherein Origen and so many other famous men read catechetic lectures at Alexandria. Eusebius says[13], 'Pantænus taught in this school anno 181; and that it was a school of sacred learning from ancient custom long before, and that it continued so to be to his own time.' St. Jerom deduces its original from St. Mark, the first founder of the Church of Alexandria, telling us[14] that Pantænus taught Christian philosophy at Alexandria, where it had been the custom of old always to have ecclesiastical doctors from the time of St. Mark.' Where, by *ecclesiastical doctors*, he does not mean the bishops and presbyters of the Church, (which were originally in all Churches as well as Alexandria,) but the doctors of Christian philosophy in the catechetic school, whereof there had been a succession from the first foundation of the Church. And the succession was continued for some ages after: for Clemens Alexandrinus[15] succeeded Pantænus; and Origen[16], Clemens; Heraclas[17], Origen; and Dionysius[18], Heraclas. After whom some[19] add

νεῖα, καὶ τὰ περὶ αὐτά.—Zonaras, ad loc. (ap. Bevereg. ibid. p. 275 c.) *Ἱεροὺς τόπους οὐ τοὺς θείους ναοὺς ἐνταῦθα καλεῖ, ἀλλὰ τὰς περὶ αὐτοὺς κατοικίας, οἷά εἰσι τὰ λεγόμενα κατηχούμενα.*

[13] L. 5. c. 10. (v. 1. p. 222. 29.) *Ἡγεῖτο δὲ τηνικαῦτα τῆς τῶν πιστῶν αὐτόθι διατριβῆς, τῶν ἀπὸ παιδείας ἀνὴρ ἐπιδοξότατος, ὄνομα αὐτῷ Πάνταινος· ἐξ ἀρχαίου ἔθους διδασκαλείου τῶν ἱερῶν λόγων παρ' αὐτοῖς συνεστῶτος· ὃ καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς παρατείνεται· καὶ πρὸς τῶν ἐν λόγῳ καὶ τῇ περὶ τὰ θεῖα σπουδῇ δυνατῶν συγκροτεῖσθαι παρειλήφαμεν.*

[14] De Scriptor. Eccles. c. 36. (t. 2. p. 861.) Pantænus, Stoicæ sectæ philosophus, juxta quandam veterum in Alexandria consuetudinem, ubi a Marco evangelista semper ecclesiastici fuere doctores ... docuit sub Severo principe, &c.

[15] Vid. Euseb. l. 6. c. 6. (v. 1. p. 264. 3.) *Πανταινὸν δὲ Κλήμης διαδεξάμενος τῆς κατ' Ἀλεξάνδρειαν κατηχήσεως εἰς ἐκεῖνο τοῦ καιροῦ καθηγεῖτο, κ. τ. λ.*

[16] Vid. Hieron. de Scriptor. Eccles. [c. 54.] in Origene. (p. 877.) Hic Alexandriæ, dispersa ecclesia, decimo octavo ætatis suæ anno, *κατηχήσεων* opus aggressus, postea a Demetrio, ejus urbis episcopo, in locum Clementis presbyteri confirmatus, per multos annos floruit.

[17] Id. et ibid. (p. 879.) Constat eum... Alexandriam reversum, Heraclam presbyterum .... adjutorem sibi fecisse *κατηχήσεως*.—Conf. Euseb. l. 6. c. 26. (v. 1. p. 292. 7.) *Ἔτος δ' ἦν τοῦτο δέκατον τῆς δηλουμένης ἡγεμονίας, καθ' ὃ τὴν ἀπ' Ἀλεξανδρείας μετανάστασιν ἐπὶ τὴν Καισάρειαν ὁ Ὠριγένης ποιησάμενος, Ἡρακλᾷ τὸ τῆς κατηχήσεως τῶν αὐτόθι διδασκαλεῖον καταλείπει.*

[18] Euseb. ibid. c. 29. (v. 1. p. 294. 18.) *Ἔν τε Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ μετὰ Δημήτριον ἐπὶ τρισὶ καὶ τεσσαράκοντα ἔτεσι τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν ἐκτελέσαντα, Ἡρακλᾶς τὴν λειτουργίαν παρείληφεν·*

Athenodorus, Malchion, Athanasius, and Didymus. And the author of the Greek Synodicon, published by Pappus, says[20] Arius taught in the same school before he broached his heresy. It were easy to recount many other such schools at Rome, Cæsarea, Antioch, &c.; but I shall have another occasion to speak of these, when I come to consider the encouragement that Christian emperors gave to schools of learning and the professors of liberal arts and sciences. What has here been suggested upon this head may suffice at present to shew what was the office of the catechist; and what the use of catechetical schools in the Church.

CHAP. XI.

Of the ecclesiecdici and defensores, or syndics of the Church.

ve sorts *defenso-* noted, owhereof lybelong- to the hurch.

1. Another office, which will deserve to be spoken of in this place, because it was sometimes, though not always, managed by the hands of the clergy, is that of the *defensores;* for the understanding of which, it will be necessary, in the first place, to distinguish between the civil and ecclesiastical defensors. For Gothofred thinks there were in all four sorts of them, viz. the *defensores senatus, defensores urbium, defensores ecclesiarum,* and *defensores pauperum.* But he might have added one more, which Ulpian[21] calls *defensores rerum publicarum;* whose office was to be a sort of proctors or syndics in managing the public causes of that corporation, or company of tradesmen, to which they belonged; which sort of defensors were first instituted by Alexander Severus, as Lampridius[22] tells us in his

τῆς δὲ τῶν αὐτόθι κατηχήσεως τὴν διατριβὴν διαδέχεται Διονύσιος, εἷς καὶ οὗτος τῶν Ὠριγένους [γενόμενος] φοιτητῶν.

19 Hospinian. de Templis, l. 3. c. 5. (p. 352. col. dextr.) Quem [Origenem] postea in eodem docendi munere Heraclas, Dionysius, Athenodorus, Malchion, Didymus, Athanasius, aliique insecuti sunt, viri non in sacris tantum sed et profanis scientiis doctissimi, quos *catechistas* vocabant a præcipua et maxime necessaria parte institutionis.

20 Ap. Labb. (CC. t. 1. p. 1494 a.) Πέτρου ἐν Κυρίῳ τελειωθέντος, Ἀχιλλᾶς διαδέχεται, καὶ Ἄρειον τῇ αἱρέσει καὶ φιλαρχίᾳ κρατούμενον, καὶ τοῖς Μελετίου τολμήμασιν ἀντιθέως συμπράττοντα, δελεασθεὶς χειροτονεῖ πρεσβύτερον, καὶ τοῦ ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ διδασκαλείου προΐστησιν.

21 Digest. l. 49. tit. 4. leg. 1. n. 13. (Corp. Jur. Civ. Lugdun. 1627. t. 3. p. 1600.) Tutores, item defensores rerum publicarum, et curatores adolescentium vel furiosi, tertium diem habere debent; idcirco quia alieno nomine appellent.

22 Vit. Alexandr. Sever. c. 83. (int. Aug. Hist. Scriptor. p. 544.) Corpora omnium constituit, vinariorum, lupinariorum, caligariorum, et omnino omnium artium; hisque ex sese defensores dedit.

Life. The *defensores civitatum*, or, as they are otherwise called, *defensores plebis*, were a sort of tribunes of the people; one of their chief offices being to defend the poor plebeians against the insults and oppressions of the great and wealthy citizens. Now in imitation of these I presume the ecclesiastical defensors were instituted, as both their name and office seem plainly to imply.

2. The *defensors of the poor* had much the same employment in the Church as the *defensores plebis* had in the State: for if any of the poor, or virgins, or widows, belonging to the Church, were injured or oppressed by the rich, it was the business of these defensors, as their proctors or advocates, to see them righted, and to solicit the magistrate that they might have justice done them. This is evident from the decree made in the fifth Council of Carthage anno 401; which is also inserted into the African Code[23], and is to this purpose; 'That, forasmuch as the Church was incessantly wearied with the complaints and afflictions of the poor, it was unanimously agreed upon by them in council, that the emperors should be petitioned to allow defensors to be chosen for them by the procurement and approbation of the bishops, that they might defend them from the power and tyranny of the rich.' Of the defensors of the poor.

3. As to *the other sort of defensors*, called *defensores ecclesiæ*, (whom I speak of separately, because Gothofred makes a distinction between them, though others take them to be the same,) their office did as plainly resemble that of the other sort of civil defensors, called *defensores rerum publicarum:* for, as those were the proctors and syndics of their respective companies, to manage the public concerns of their societies at law upon all emergent occasions; so these did the same for the Church, whose syndics they were, being employed to solicit the cause of the Church, or any single ecclesiastic, when they were injured or oppressed, and had occasion for redress in a Of the defensors ecclesiæ their office and function.

[23] C. 9. (t. 2. p. 1217 a.) Ab imperatoribus universis visum est postulandum, propter afflictionem pauperum, quorum molestiis sine intermissione fatigatur ecclesia, ut defensores eis, adversus potentias divitum, cum episcoporum provisione, delegentur.—Conf. Cod. Eccles. Afric. c. 75. (ibid. p. 1095 a.) *Σύμπασιν ἔδοξεν αἰτῆσαι ἀπὸ τῶν βασιλέων διὰ τὴν πενήτων κάκωσιν, ὧν ταῖς ἐπαχθείαις ἀπαύστως ἡ ἐκκλησία παρενοχλεῖται, ὥστε ἐκδίκους τούτοις, μετὰ τῆς τῶν ἐπισκόπων προνοίας, ἐπιλεγῆναι κατὰ τῆς τῶν πλουσίων τυραννίδος.*

civil court; or if they were not remedied there, they were to address the emperors themselves, in the name of the Church, to procure a particular precept in her favour. Thus Possidius tells us, in the Life of St. Austin[24], 'that when the Circumcellions in their mad zeal had plundered and slain some of the catholic clergy, the defensor of the Church prosecuted them at law for the fact, that the peace of the Church might no more be disturbed or impeded.' In the like manner we read in the first Council of Carthage[25], 'that it being a thing against the imperial laws for any layman to impose a secular office upon a clergyman; if any such injury was offered to the Church,' it is said, 'the affront might be redressed, if the defensors of the Church did not fail in their duty:' which plainly implies that it was the business of the defensors to see the rights of the Church, that were settled upon her by law, truly maintained; and if any encroachments were made upon them, they were to prosecute the aggressors and invaders before the magistrates, and execute the sentence, which they gave in favour of the Church. It is further observable, from a law of Arcadius and Honorius, recited in the next paragraph, that in case of necessity, they were likewise to make application to the emperors, and bring their mandate to the inferior judges, when they could not otherwise have justice done them. By a canon of the Council of Chalcedon, defensors are also empowered to admonish such idle monks and clerks, as resorted to the royal city of Constantinople without any licence or commission from their bishops; and if after admonition they continued still to loiter there, the same defensors were to expel them thence by force[26], and cause them to return to their own habitation. It appears also from Justinian's laws[27], that the *defensors*, to-

[24] Vit. August. c. 12. (t. 10. append. p. 265.) De qua re, ne pacis ecclesiæ amplius impediretur profectus, defensor ecclesiæ inter leges non siluit, &c.

[25] C. 9. (t. 2. p. 716 d.) .... Et ipsis non liceat clericos nostros eligere apothecarios vel ratiocinatores. Quod si injuria constitutionis imperatoriæ clericos inquietandos putaverint, si defensio ecclesiastica nos non deridet, pudor publicus vindicabitur.

[26] C. 23. (t. 4. p. 766 e.) Ὥρισε τοίνυν ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος, τοὺς τοιούτους ὑπομιμνήσκεσθαι μὲν πρότερον διὰ τοῦ ἐκδίκου τῆς κατὰ Κωνσταντινούπολιν ἁγιωτάτης ἐκκλησίας, ἐπὶ τῷ ἐξελθεῖν τῆς βασιλευούσης πόλεως· εἰ δὲ τοῖς αὐτοῖς πράγμασιν ἐπιμένοιεν, ἀναισχυντοῦντες, καὶ ἄκοντας αὐτοὺς διὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐκβάλλεσθαι, καὶ τοὺς ἰδίους καταλαμβάνειν τόπους.

[27] Novel. 59. c. 1 et seqq. (t. 5. pp. 300, 301.) Primum itaque, &c.

gether with the *œconomi*, were made a sort of superintendents over the *copiatæ*, or great body of deans, whose business was to attend at funerals, as has been shewed before; the defensors were charged with the care of these, both in reference to their revenues and persons. They were likewise to make inquiry, whether every clerk, belonging to the church, carefully attended the celebration of morning and evening service in the church; and to inform the bishop of such as neglected, that they might be proceeded against with ecclesiastical censures[28]. These were the chief, if not the only offices, of the defensors in the primitive Church. For as to any spiritual power or jurisdiction over the clergy, they had none; nor were they as yet admitted to hear criminal causes, great or little, in the bishop's name. But these things were devolved upon them in later ages, as Morinus[29] shews at large in a long dissertation upon this subject, to which I refer the inquisitive reader, contenting myself to give such an account of the defensors' office and power, as I find it to have been in the ages next after their institution.

Of their quality;—whether they were clergymen or laymen.

4. The next inquiry must be into their *quality*;—whether they were of the clergy or laity? For learned men are not agreed about this. Petavius[30] says they were always laymen; but Morinus[31] and Gothofred[32], with much better reason,

[28] Vid. Cod. Justin. l. 1. tit. 3. de Episcopis, leg. 42. n. 10. (t. 4. p. 113.).... *Διὸ παντὶ τρόπῳ τοὺς κληρικοὺς ψάλλειν κελεύομεν, καὶ καταζητεῖσθαι αὐτοὺς παρὰ τῶν κατὰ καιρὸν θεοφιλεστάτων ἐπισκόπων, καὶ δύο πρῶτον πρεσβυτέρων* [leg. *πρωτοπρεσβυτέρων*] *ἑκάστης ἐκκλησίας καὶ τοῦ καλουμένου ἄρχοντος ἤτοι ἐξάρχου, καὶ τοῦ ἐκδίκου ἑκάστης ἁγιωτάτης ἐκκλησίας· καὶ τοὺς μὴ εὑρισκομένους ἀμέμπτως ταῖς λειτουργίαις προσκαρτεροῦντας ἔξω τοῦ κλήρου καθίστασθαι.*

[29] De Ordinat. Eccles. part. 3. exercit. 16. c. 7. per tot. (pp. 236, seqq.) Sexto nobis, &c.

[30] In Epiphan. Hær. 72. n. 10. (p. 305.) *Defensorem* reddidimus: nam *præsidem* cum Cornario interpretari non placet. Fuit autem defensor non ordinis, sed officii nomen, quod laici gerebant, qui ecclesiæ jura in civili foro propugnabant.

[31] Ut supr. c. 6. n. 16. (p. 234 d. 9.) Dico ex antiquis monumentis constare, illos ecclesiarum defensores potissimum fuisse clericos. Dicit enim Synodus Chalced., *Si œconomum aut defensorem aut paramonarium promoveat episcopus*, etc. Sed œconomus erat clericus, ergo et defensor. Deinde dignitatem illam conferebat episcopus. Probabilissimum est igitur nulli alii quam clerico illam contulisse. Præterea ejusdem Concilii c. 23 auctoritatem dat defensori Constantinopolitano urbe ejiciendi clericos et monachos, in ea sine episcopi mandato diversantes, eosque domum repetere cogendi. Sane non videntur patres laico homini potestatem istam in clericos et monachos concessuri. Hoc confirmat ejusdem Concilii actio 1, in qua sæpius refertur Joannes

assert the contrary; that at first they were generally chosen out of the clergy, till for some particular reasons it was thought most proper to have advocates-at-law to discharge this office in the African Churches. This change was made about the year 407, when the African fathers in the Council of Carthage[33] petitioned the emperor Honorius, 'that he would give them leave to choose their defensors out of the *scholastici* or *advocates-at-law*, who were actually concerned in pleading of causes; that so they who took upon them the defence of the Churches might have the same liberty as the provincial priests were used to have, to go upon necessary occasion into the judge's consistory, or council-chamber behind the veil, and there suggest what they thought necessary to promote their own cause, or obviate the plots of their adversaries.' In answer to this petition, Honorius shortly after published a law, wherein he granted them liberty to make use of such advocates for their defensors as they desired; for he decreed[34], 'that whatever privileges were specially obtained of the emperor relating to the Church should be intimated to the judges, and executed *non per coronatos, not by clergymen*, (as Gothofred rightly explains it,) but by advocates-at-law.' So that now it was no longer necessary that the defensors should be

quidam presbyter et defensor; et infra videbimus quemdam Romanum defensorem sacerdotali dignitate insignitum. Solebat enim Gregorius defensores et rectores patrimoniorum ecclesiæ presbyteros, diaconos, et subdiaconos, constituere, ut legere est in ejus vita apud Joannem diaconum, lib. 1. c. 53; immo et episcopos, ut ipse testatur, l. 10. ep. 46.

[32] Not. in Cod. Theod. l. 16. tit. 2. de Episcopis, leg. 38. (t. 6. p. 77.) Clerici hactenus ipsi ad ecclesiarum defensionem judiciis sese stetisse videntur: id quod tandem ipsis ecclesiasticis indecens visum: visumque satius, per advocatos, et sic laicos, simul et forensium rerum peritos, ecclesiam et ecclesiastica privilegia in civili foro defendi.

[33] C. Africanum vulgo dictum, c. 46. (t. 2. p. 1661 b.) Placuit .... ut petant ... legati ... a gloriosissimis imperatoribus, ut dent facultatem defensores constituendi scholasticos, qui in actu sunt, vel in munere defensionis causarum; ut more sacerdotum provinciæ, iidem ipsi, qui defensionem ecclesiarum susceperint, habeant facultatem pro negotiis ecclesiarum, quoties necessitas flagitaverit, vel ad obsistendum obrepentibus, vel ad necessaria suggerenda, ingredi judicum secretaria. — See also Cod. Eccles. Afric. c. 97. (CC. ibid. p. 1113 e.) and C. Milev. c. 16. (ibid. p. 1541 d.) to the same purpose.

[34] Ap. Cod. Theod. l. 16. tit. 2. de Episcopis, leg. 38. (t. 6. p. 76.)..... Ut quæcunque de nobis ad ecclesiam tantum pertinentia, specialiter fuerint impetrata, non per coronatos, sed ab advocatis, eorum arbitratu, et judicibus innotescant, et sortiantur effectum, &c.

of the clergy, but the office was frequently intrusted in the hands of laymen. Which is further evident from an Epistle of Pope Zosimus, who lived about the same time; for he says[35] 'the defensors of the Church were chosen out of the laity, and might afterward, if they were deserving, be ordained among the clergy.' Yet after this we find the defensors in some places continued still to be of the clergy: for Morinus shews, that in the first session of the Council of Chalcedon[36] there is frequent mention made of one John *a presbyter and defensor;* as also, in many Epistles of Gregory the Great, the defensors of the Roman Church are said to be of the clergy. To which I shall add a Fragment of Theodorus Lector, taken out of Damascen[37], which speaks of one John as both deacon and defensor of the Church of St. Stephen at Constantinople, in the time of Anastasius the emperor, which was in the beginning of the sixth century. From all which it is very evident against Petavius, that the defensors were sometimes chosen out of the clergy, and not always made of advocates or laymen.

The ἔκδικοι and ἐκκλησιέκδικοι among the Greeks the same with the defensors of the Latin Church.

5. I must not omit to acquaint the reader, that what the Latins call *defensores*, the Greek Church commonly calls ἔκδικοι and ἐκκλησιέκδικοι, which signify the same as defensors, though Gothofred[38], without any just reason, makes a difference between them. For not only their offices and powers are described to be the same, but also whenever the Greeks have any occasion to speak of the Latin defensors, they give them the name of ἔκδικοι: as may be seen either in the Code of the African Church[39], published by Justellus, or that which the Greeks commonly call the Council of Carthage, published by

[35] Ep. 1. c. 3. (CC. t. 2. p. 1557 c.) ..... Defensores ecclesiæ, qui ex laicis fiunt, supradicta observatione teneantur, si meruerint esse in ordine clericatus.

[36] Act. 1. (t. 4. p. 156 a.) Ἰωάννης ὁ εὐλαβέστατος πρεσβύτερος καὶ ἔκδικος.—[Conf. ibid. (p. 250 b. et p. 251 a.) ubi eadem verba leguntur. Ed.]

[37] Orat. 3. de Imaginibus, (t. 1. p. 377 a.) Vid. ap. Theod. Lect. Fragm. (v. 3. p. 589. 22.) Ἰωάννης δέ τις διάκονος, καὶ ἔκδικος τοῦ προλεχθέντος εὐαγοῦς οἴκου Στεφάνου, τοῦ τῶν μαρτύρων πρώτου, κ. τ. λ.

[38] Not. in Cod. Theod. l. 16. tit. 2. leg. 38. (t. 6. p. 78.) Ut ad istos de foro seu laicos defensores revertamur, cum his ..... perperam misceri video προστάτας seu ἐκδίκους, de quibus Epiphanius ante hanc legem, Hæresi Marcellianorum 72, et Can. 1. Chalced. Hi enim inter clericos vel clericis proximi censentur.

[39] C. 75. (CC. t. 2. p. 1095 a.) ..... Ὥστε ἐκδίκους τούτοις μετὰ τῆς τῶν ἐπισκόπων προνοίας ἐπιλεγῆναι κατὰ τῆς τῶν πλουσίων τυραννίδος.—It. c. 97. (ibid. p. 1114 e.) ... Ὥστε δοθῆναι ἄδειαν τοῦ καταστῆσαι ἐκδίκους σχολαστικούς, κ. τ. λ.

Ehinger[40], and Dr. Beveridge[41] in the Pandects. But whether προστάτης be another Greek name for a defensor is not so certain. The word is only found once used by Epiphanius[42], who, speaking of one Cyriacus, styles him Κυριακὸς προστάτης, which Petavius renders *Cyriacus defensor*. He seems indeed to have had some office in the Church, because he is joined in the subscription of a letter with the clergy, presbyters, deacons, subdeacons, and readers: but whether that be a sufficient reason to make him a defensor, I must leave the judicious reader to determine.

Chancellors and defensors not the same in the primitive Church.

6. There is one thing more must be resolved before I dismiss this subject; that is, *whether chancellors and defensors were the same in the primitive Church?* In answer to which I say, it is very plain they were not; because the first time we find any mention of the office of chancellors in the Church, they are expressly distinguished from the ἔκδικοι or *defensors;* and that is in the Novel of Heraclius, made in the beginning of the seventh century, where, determining the number of ecclesiastical officers that were to be allowed in the great church of Constantinople, he says[43], 'there should be two syncelli, twelve chancellors, ten defensors, twelve referendaries, forty notaries, and twelve secuophylaces; whereof four to be presbyters, six deacons, and two readers.' It is not very easy to determine what the office of these chancellors was at that time: but it is very evident however from this, that they were not the same with the defensors. They, who are acquainted with the Civil Law, know that the *cancellarii* in the civil courts were not judges, but officers attending the judge in an inferior station, which appears evidently from a title in both the Theo-

[40] Græce, ap. Ehinger. c. 76. (p. 265.) . . . Ὥστε ἐκδίκους τούτοις μετὰ τῆς τῶν ἐπισκόπων προνοίας ἐπιλεγῆναι, κ. τ. λ.—It. c. 99. (p. 291.) . . . . . Αἰτήσωσιν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐνδοξοτάτων βασιλέων, ὥστε δοθῆναι ἄδειαν τοῦ καταστῆσαι ἐκδίκους σχολαστικοὺς, κ. τ. λ.

[41] Ap. Bevereg. c. 78. (t. 1. p. 612 c.) Περὶ ἐκδίκων τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τῶν ὀφειλόντων παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως αἰτηθῆναι . . ὥστε ἐκδίκους τούτοις μετὰ τῆς τῶν ἐπισκόπων προνοίας ἐπιλέγεσθαι, κ. τ. λ.—It. c. 100. (ibid. p. 634 c.) Αἰτήσωσιν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐνδοξοτάτων βασιλέων, ὥστε δοθῆναι ἄδειαν τοῦ καταστῆσαι ἐκδίκους σχολαστικοὺς, κ. τ. λ.

[42] Hær. 72. Marcellian. n. 10. (t. 1. p. 842 d.)

[43] Novel. 2. ap. Leunclav. Jus Gr. Rom. (t. 1. p. 79. col. sinistr.) Τοὺς μὲν θεοφιλεῖς συγκέλλους εἰς δύο τὸν ἀριθμὸν περιστάντας, καγκελαρίους δὲ εἰς ιβ', ἐκδίκους δὲ εἰς ι', ῥεφερενδαρίους δὲ εἰς ιβ', νοταρίους δὲ εἰς μ', σκευοφύλακας δὲ, πρεσβυτέρους μὲν δ', διακόνους δὲ ς', ἀναγνώστας δὲ δύο.

dosian[44] and Justinian Code[45], *De assessoribus et domesticis et cancellariis judicum.* Hottoman and Accursius take them for actuaries or notaries; but Gothofred[46], in his learned notes upon the Theodosian Code, proves at large, out of Cassiodore and Agathias, that they were the *custodes secretarii, the guards of the judge's consistory,* and called *cancellarii,* because they stood *ad cancellos, at the rails* or *barriers* which separated the *secretum* from the rest of the court. So that their office then was not to sit as judges or assessors, but only to attend the judges, and keep peace and good order under him. And if this was the condition of the *cancellarii* in the State, it is probable they had some such office in the Church in the time of Heraclius, who first mentions them; but what that office was I am not able to determine any further, save only that it was not the same with that of the defensors of the Church.

Whether the defensors' office was the same with that of our modern chancellors.

7. It may be asked then, whether the office of our modern chancellors has any relation or resemblance to that of defensors in the ancient Church? There are some learned men who make them altogether the same. Bp. Beveridge derives the authority of them both from the same fountain; for he says[47] 'the defensors heard and determined causes in the bishop's name, and those not only that related to the poor, who sought the patronage of the Church, but also when presbyters and deacons had any controversy with any other, whether of the clergy or laity, they might bring their action before the πρωτέκδικος or *defensor.*' Whence he concludes, that chancellors of later ages are the very same ecclesiastical officials as the defensors of the primitive Church. It were to be wished that that learned person had given us ancient records for that power which he ascribes to the old defensors, for then they would

[44] L. 1. tit. 12. de Assessoribus, Domesticis, et Cancellariis. (t. 1. pp. 66, seqq.)

[45] L. 1. tit. 51. de Assessoribus, et Domesticis, et Cancellariis Judicum. (t. 4. pp. 307, seqq.)

[46] In Cod. Theod. l. 1. tit. 12. de Assessoribus, leg. 3, (t. 1. pp. 70, seqq.

[47] Not. in c. 23. C. Chalced. (t. 2. append. p. 122.) Instituti sunt ergo defensores ne pauperum vexationibus ecclesia diutius fatigaretur..... Et quidem πρωτέκδικον minores ecclesiasticas audiisse causas ex ordine officialium ecclesiæ Constantinopolitanæ constat....—(Ibid. p. 123.) Hinc enim constat presbyteris et diaconis, ... cum quocunque vel clerico vel laico litem habentibus, eandem olim licuisse apud πρωτέκδικον movere, &c.

have looked more like chancellors under another name. But indeed the authorities he alleges are all modern, such as Papias's Glossary, and Balsamon's Meditata, and the Catalogues of Officials in the Church of Constantinople, which were written several ages after the first institution of defensors, and in times when the *proteodicus* among the Greeks was become an officer of great authority and power. So that though the power of chancellors might be much the same as that of the ἔκδικοι among the modern Greeks, yet that it was altogether the same with the ancient defensors seems not hitherto to be solidly proved; since the business of the ancient defensors was not to do the office of judges, but of advocates-at-law, to defend the rights of the poor and the liberties of the Church against all aggressors and invaders. But if any can shew from ancient records that the defensors had a larger power, he will very much oblige the world with such a discovery. In the mean time the reader will pardon me for not ascribing to them greater powers than I had authority to do. The matter is curious, and may exercise the pens of learned men, and be the subject of further disquisition and inquiry.

CHAP. XII.

Of the œconomi.

1. In the writings of the fourth and fifth centuries we frequently meet with an officer in the Church styled by the Greeks[48] οἰκονόμος, and by the Latins[49] *œconomus*, or *præpositus domus*, as it is in St. Austin[50]. His office was to manage the revenues of the whole diocese under the inspection of the bishop. For anciently, as I have shewed elsewhere[51], the whole revenue of the Church was intrusted in the hands of the

1. Œconomi instituted in the fourth century. The reasons of their institution.

[48] Vid. C. Chalced. c. 2. (t. 4. p. 755 b.) Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος .... προβάλλοιτο ἐπὶ χρήμασιν, ἢ οἰκονόμον, ἢ ἔκδικον, κ. τ. λ.—It. c. 25. (ibid. p. 767 d.) Τὴν μέν τοι πρόσοδον τῆς χηρευούσης ἐκκλησίας σώαν φυλάττεσθαι παρὰ τῷ οἰκονόμῳ τῆς ἐκκλησίας.—It. c. 26. See n. 54, next page.

[49] Liberat. Breviar. c. 16. (CC. t. 5. p. 765 c.) Cum quibus erat Joannes ex œconomo presbyter factus Tabennesiotis..... Factusque est iterum œconomus, habens causas omnium ecclesiarum.

[50] Vid. Possid. Vit. August. c. 24. (t. 10. append. 273 c.) Domus ecclesiæ curam, omnemque substantiam ad vices valentioribus clericis delegabat et credebat. Numquam clavem, numquam annulum in manu habens; sed ab eisdem domus præpositis cuncta et accepta et erogata notabantur, &c.

[51] B. 2. ch. 4. s. 6. v. 1. p. 93.

bishop, to be divided among the clergy and poor of the Church by his direction and appointment; and in managing this affair he commonly made use of his archdeacon, as a proper assistant to ease himself of the great burden and encumbrance of it. But upon the general conversion of heathens, and the consequent augmentation of every diocese, and church-revenues, both the bishop and his archdeacon had business enough of another nature to take up the greatest part of their time; and then it was found necessary to institute officers on purpose, and set them over this affair, under the name of *œconomi*, or *stewards* of the Church. Morinus[52] thinks they were instituted to avoid suspicion, and in some Churches there is no question but it was so; for in the remaining fragments of the Council of Tyre, anno 448, which are inserted into the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon[53], we find that Ibas bishop of Edessa, being accused by some of his clergy for embezzling the revenues of the Church, is obliged to promise that for the future the revenues should be managed by *œconomi*, or *stewards*, chosen out of the clergy, after the manner of the great Church of Antioch. And it is not improbable but the like accusation being brought against Dioscorus bishop of Alexandria, in the Council of Chalcedon, was the reason that moved that Council to make a general decree in this matter[54], 'that forasmuch as they were informed that in some Churches the bishops alone administered the ecclesiastical revenues without any stewards, they now ordained, that every Church having a bishop should also have a steward of her own clergy to manage the reve-

[52] De Ordinat. Eccles. part. 3. exercit. 16. c. 5. n. 3. (p. 288 b. 11.) Cum igitur bona tam immobilia quam quotidianæ fidelium oblationes ad omnem clerum pertinerent, nec esset designata aliqua pars, quæ hujus vel illius esset clerici, his bonis curandis, administrandis, et distribuendis deputatus erat e clero aliquis, quem œconomum canones appellant; ne, si episcopus ea solus administrasset, excepisset, distribuisset, suspectus aliquando fieret rei communis male administratæ, surreptæ, sibi vindicatæ, atque eo nomine apud clerum et laicos male audiret.

[53] Act. 9. (t. 4. p. 631 a.) Ἔδοξε τῷ αὐτῷ θεοφιλεστάτῳ ἐπισκόπῳ Ἰβᾳ ἐξ οἰκείας γνώμης ἐπαγγείλασθαι, ὅτι δὴ τοῦ λοιποῦ κατὰ τύπον τὸν ἐν τῇ μεγίστῃ τῶν Ἀντιοχέων ἐκκλησίᾳ διοικεῖται τὰ πράγματα διὰ οἰκονόμων ἐκ τοῦ κλήρου προβαλλομένων ὑπὸ τῆς αὐτοῦ θεοσεβείας.

[54] Vid. C. Chalced. c. 26. (ibid. p. 767 c.) Ἐπειδὴ δέ ἔν τισιν ἐκκλησίαις, ὡς περιηχήθημεν, δίχα οἰκονόμων οἱ ἐπίσκοποι τὰ ἐκκλησιαστικὰ χειρίζουσι πράγματα· ἔδοξε πᾶσαν ἐκκλησίαν ἐπίσκοπον ἔχουσαν, καὶ οἰκονόμον ἔχειν ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου κλήρου, οἰκονομοῦντα τὰ ἐκκλησιαστικὰ κατὰ γνώμην τοῦ ἰδίου ἐπισκόπου· ὥστε μὴ ἁμάρτυρον εἶναι τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῆς

nues of the Church by the direction of the bishop: that so there might be witnesses of the right administration of them; and by that means neither the Church's goods be embezzled, nor any scandal or reproach brought upon the priesthood.' But then I cannot think this was the case of all Churches: for these canons were made plainly against such bishops as managed the revenues of the Church *ἀμαρτύροι*, as the canon words it, without either archdeacon or *œconomus* to *attest* the fidelity of their management. But in such Churches, where bishops took the assistance of their archdeacon, this could not be the reason for setting up the office of the *œconomus;* because suspicion of mismanagement was provided against, as well by the testimony of an archdeacon, as of any other officer that could be appointed. And therefore I have assigned a more general, and, as I take it, a truer reason for the institution of this office in the Church.

Always to be chosen out of the clergy.

2. And that which further confirms my opinion is, that the *œconomi*, as well as the archdeacons, were always to be chosen out of the clergy. For so those canons of the Councils of Tyre and Chalcedon already cited plainly direct; and for any thing that appears to the contrary, this was the constant practice of the Church. We find in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus[55], which are inserted also in the Council of Chalcedon, one Charisius styled both presbyter and *œconomus* of the Church of Philadelphia. And Liberatus[56] speaks of one John, who was *œconomus* of Alexandria and presbyter of Tabennesus, a region belonging to Alexandria. Possidius tells us in the Life of S. Austin[57], 'that he always made one of his clergy the *præpositus domus*,' as he calls him, 'whose office was to take care of the church-revenues, and give an account of what he received and expended when it was demanded of him.' And to the same purpose Socrates[58] says of Theophilus, bishop of Alexan-

ἐκκλησίας, καὶ ἐκ τούτου τὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας σκορπίζεσθαι πράγματα, καὶ λοιδορίαν τῇ ἱερωσύνῃ προστρίβεσθαι.

[55] Ap. Act. 1. C. Chalced. (t. 4. p. 292 b.) Sanctissimo et universali Concilio, Deo amabili, congregato in Ephesina civitate metropoli, a Charisio presbytero et œconomo Philadelphiæ.

[56] Breviar. c. 16. See s. 1. n. 49, preceding.

[57] C. 24. See ibid. n. 50.

[58] L. 6. c. 7. (v. 2. p. 320. 5.) ... *Δύο δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν παρεκάλεσε συνεῖναι αὐτῷ, καὶ μόλις μὲν ἔπεισεν· ὡς ἐπίσκοπος δὲ ὅμως καὶ προσηνάγκασεν, καὶ τῇ τῶν κληρικῶν ἀξίᾳ τιμήσας, τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῆς ἐκκλησίας αὐτοῖς ἐνεχείρισεν.*

dria, 'that having advanced two monks to the honour of the clergy, he made them the *œconomi* of the Church.' So that it was both the rule and practice of the Church to take the *œconomi* out of some of the clergy, and we never meet with any instance or order to the contrary; which argues plainly, that the true reason for devolving this office upon them, which formerly belonged to the archdeacons, was no other than that because of a multiplicity of business the archdeacons now could not so well attend it.

Their of to take of the r nues of Church, especiall in the v cancy of bishopri

3. What the office itself was appears from what has already been said; to which I shall only add one thing, that by the authority of the Council of Chalcedon[59], the *œconomus* was to continue in his office during the vacancy of the bishopric, and to look after the income of the church, that it might be preserved safe for the succeeding bishop; which canon, some not improbably think, was designed to prevent delays in filling of vacant sees; that no metropolitan or interventor, under whose care the vacant church was, might lie under any temptation to defer the election of a new bishop in hopes of enriching himself from the revenues of the church. But whether this was the reason or not, it certainly argues that these men were generally persons of extraordinary credit and worth, since the Church could securely repose so great a confidence in them.

The con sent of clergy r quired i the choi of them.

4. And indeed all imaginable care was taken in their election that they should be persons of such a character: to which purpose some canons required that they should be chosen by all the clergy; as particularly Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, in his Canonical Epistle[60], gives a direction in that case. Which provision was but reasonable; for since all the clergy had a common concern in the revenues of the Church, which were their livelihood and subsistence, it was fit the *œconomus*, to whose care the revenues were committed, should be chosen by common consent, that he might be a person without exception, and no one have reason to complain that he was injured or defrauded of his dividend or portion.

[59] C. 25. See s. 1. second part of n. 48, preceding.

[60] C. 9. ap. Bevereg. Pandect. (t. 2. part. 1. p. 173 c.) Ὥστε γνώμῃ παντὸς ἱερατείου οἰκονόμον ἀποδειχθῆναι ἕτερον, κ. τ. λ.

CHAP. XIII.

A brief account of some other inferior officers in the Church.

Of the παραμονάριοι or mansionarii.

1. Beside the officers already mentioned, there were in the fourth and fifth centuries some few others, whose names are not very commonly met with; and therefore I shall but just hint the signification of them, and not spend my time in any curious inquiries about their offices and employments. The same canon[61] of the Council of Chalcedon, which speaks of the *œconomus* and *defensor*, mentions also another officer belonging to the Church, who is styled παραμονάριος in the language of that Council. But the translators and critics are not agreed upon the meaning of the word. The ancient translation of Dionysius Exiguus renders it *mansionarius*, and explains that in a marginal reading by *ostiarius*, or *door-keeper* of the church. And indeed this was the office of the *mansionarius* in the Roman Church, about the time when Dionysius Exiguus lived. For Gregory the Great, not long after, in one of his Dialogues[62], speaking of Abundius Mansionarius, gives him also the title of *custos ecclesiæ;* and in another Dialogue[63] he makes it the office of the *mansionarius* to light the lamps or candles of the church. Yet, notwithstanding this, the best learned of the modern critics give another sense of the Greek name παραμονάριος. Justellus[64] explains it by *villicus, a bailiff* or *steward of the lands.* Bishop Beveridge[65] styles him *rerum ecclesiasticarum administrator*, which is the same. And their opinion is confirmed by Gothofred, Cujacius, Suicerus, Vossius, and many others, whose judgment in the case may

[61] C. 2. (t. 4. p. 755 b.) Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος . . προβάλλοιτο ἐπὶ χρήμασιν ἢ οἰκονόμον, ἢ ἔκδικον, ἢ προσμονάριον, κ. τ. λ.

[62] Dial. l. 3. c. 25. (t. 1. p. 333.) The title is thus,—*De Acontio mansionario ecclesiæ Beati Petri.* Alius illic non ante longa tempora, sicut nostri seniores referunt, custos ecclesiæ Acontius* dictus est, magnæ humilitatis atque gravitatis vir, &c.

[63] L. 1. c. 5. (ibid. p. 173 d. 2 et 9.) . . . . Constantius nomine, mansionarii functus officio . . . . omnes lampades ecclesiæ implevit aqua, &c.

[64] Bibl. Jur. Canon. (t. 1. p. 91.) Paramonarii sunt villici sive actores possessionum.

[65] Not. in C. Chalced. c. 2. (t. 2. append. p. 109.) Παραμονάριος omni procul dubio aliquem rerum ecclesiasticarum administratorem significat.

* [Pauci habent Abundius, quos editores secuti sunt. Legitur etiam Abundius in Græca Versione. Ed. Bened. ad loc. Ed.]

be sufficient to decide the controversy, till the reader sees better reason otherwise to determine him.

2. The Civil Law takes notice of another sort of officers, who are called *custodes ecclesiarum* and *custodes locorum sanctorum;* which though some writers confound together, yet Gothofred makes a distinction between them. The *custodes ecclesiarum* were either the same with the *ostiarii*, or order of *door-keepers*, or else with those called *seniores ecclesiæ*, which, as I have shewed in another place[66], were much of the same nature with our church-wardens and vestry-men. But the *custodes locorum sanctorum* were the keepers of those particular places in Palestine which, if Gothofred judges right, had more peculiarly the title of *loca sancta, holy places*, because they were a sort of memorials of our Saviour; such as Bethlehem, the place of his nativity; and Mount Golgotha, the place of his crucifixion; and his grave or monument, which was the place of his resurrection; and Mount Olivet, the place of his ascension. These places were frequently visited by Christians in those ages, as appears from Eusebius, Gregory Nyssen, St. Jerom, and several others, whom the reader that is curious in this matter may find quoted by Gothofred[67], who maintains, that upon that very account those places had a sort of guardians or keepers assigned them, under the title of *custodes locorum sanctorum.* But however this matter be, it is certain they had such an employment in the Church, as in the eye of the law was reputed a religious service; and accordingly they were entitled to the same privilege[68] as the ecclesiastics had, to be exempt from personal tribute, in regard to this their em-

Of the *custodes ecclesiarum* and *custodes locorum sanctorum*, and how those differed from each other.

[66] B. 2. ch. 19. s. 19. v. 1. p. 244.

[67] In Cod. Theod. l. 16. tit. 2. de Episcopis, leg. 26. (t. 6. p. 59.)..... *Loca sancta* hic sunt, quæ in Palæstina inter alia sub comite Orientis, cui hæc lex ideo inscribitur, atque Hierosolymis nominatim sita erant. Nempe *loca sancta*, quæ Hierosolymis erant, et in vicinis Palæstinæ partibus, hoc sæculo adiri jam certatim solita, quibus hæc ad pietatem irritamenta visa, *μελέται πρὸς ἀρετὴν* seu *γυμνασίαι πρὸς θεοσέβειαν*, et abducendam mentem ab humanis rebus, et cogitationes suas ad Deum transferendas, &c.

[68] Vid. Cod. Theod. ut supra (ibid. p. 59.) Universos, quos constiterit custodes ecclesiarum esse, vel sanctorum locorum, ac religiosis obsequiis deservire, nullius adtentationis molestiam sustinere decernimus. Quis enim eos capite censos patiatur esse devinctos, quos necessario intelligit supra memorato obsequio mancipatos?

ployment; as appears from a law of Theodosius the Great, by whom this immunity was granted them.

Of the *sceuophylaces*, or *cimeliarcha*.

3. Next to these, for the similitude of the name and office, I mention the *sceuophylaces*, or, as they were otherwise called, *κειμηλίων φύλακες*, *keepers of the κειμήλια*, that is, the sacred vessels, utensils, and such precious things, as were laid up in the sacred repository of the church. This was commonly some presbyter: for Theodorus Lector[69] says, Macedonius was both presbyter and *sceuophylax* of the Church of Constantinople; and Sozomen[70] before him, speaking of the famous Theodore, presbyter of Antioch, who suffered martyrdom in the days of Julian, styles him *φύλακα τῶν κειμηλίων*, *keeper of the sacred utensils;* and says, 'he was put to death because he would not deliver up what he had under his custody to the persecutors.' It will not be improper to give this officer also the name of *chartophylax* and *custos archivorum*, because the *rolls* and *archives* are reckoned part of the sacred repository of the church. Whence Suicerus[71] observes, that in Photius the names *sceuophylax* and *chartophylax* are given to the same person. But I must note, that the modern Greeks have a little changed this office, and added powers to it which did not belong to it in the primitive Church. For now, as Balsamon[72] informs us, the *chartophylax* acts as the patriarch's substitute, excommunicating, censuring, and licensing the ordinations of presbyters and deacons, and sits as supreme ecclesiastical judge, under the patriarch, in many other cases relating to the Church; which are things we do not find belonging to the office of a *sceuophylax* in the primitive ages.

[69] Lib. 2. (v. 3. p. 573. 18.) Προχειρίζεται δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς εἰς ἐπίσκοπον Μακεδόνιόν τινα, τῆς ἐκκλησίας πρεσβύτερον καὶ σκευοφύλακα.

[70] L. 5. c. 8. (v. 2. p. 190. 27.)... Μόνον δὲ Θεώδορον τὸν πρεσβύτερον, μὴ ὑποχωρῆσαι τῆς πόλεως· ὃν ὡς φύλακα τῶν κειμηλίων, τὴν τούτων γνῶσιν καταμηνῦσαι δυνάμενον, συλλαβὼν, δεινῶς ἠκίσατο.

[71] Thes. Eccles. in voce σκευοφύλαξ. (t. 2. p. 972.) Σκευοφύλαξ dictus, qui sacræ ecclesiæ vasa custodiebat .... Dicebatur interdum et χαρτοφύλαξ. Unde iste Eulampius, ad quem Photius scripsit, alibi vocatur χαρτοφύλαξ.

[72] In c. 9. C. Nicæn. 2. [al. Univers. 7.] (ap. Bevereg. t. 1. p. 299 f.) ....Ἰδικῶς δὲ ἀφωρίσθησαν τῷ σεκρέτῳ τοῦ χαρτοφυλακείου τὰ ἐπισκοπικὰ δίκαια· καὶ ὁ κατὰ καιροὺς χαρτοφύλαξ ἐνεργεῖ δικαίῳ τοῦ κατὰ καιροὺς ἁγιωτάτου πατριάρχου πάντα τὰ τούτῳ ἀνήκοντα ὡς ἐπισκόπῳ .. ἀφορίζει γὰρ, διορθοῦται ψυχικὰ σφάλματα, διακόνους καὶ ἱερεῖς ἐπιτρέπει χειροτονεῖσθαι, τὰ τῶν ἱεροτελεστιῶν πιττάκια ἐκτίθεται, καὶ ἄλλα τοιαῦτά τινα.

4. Epiphanius[73] takes notice of another sort of officers in the Church, to whom he gives the name of ἑρμηνευταὶ, *interpreters*, and says, 'their office was to render one language into another, as there was occasion, both in reading the Scriptures and in the homilies that were made to the people.' That there was such an office in the Church appears further from the Passion of Procopius the martyr, published by Valesius[74], where it is said, 'that Procopius had three offices in the Church of Scythopolis: he was reader, exorcist, and interpreter of the Syriac tongue.' I conceive the office was chiefly in such Churches where the people spake different languages; as in the Churches of Palestine, where probably some spake Syriac and others Greek; and in the Churches of Afric, where some spake Latin and others Punic. In such Churches there was occasion for an interpreter, that those, who understood not the language in which the Scriptures were read or the homilies preached, might receive edification by having them immediately rendered into a tongue which they did understand. So far was the primitive Church from encouraging ignorance by locking up the Scriptures in an unknown tongue, that she not only translated them into all languages, but also appointed a standing office of interpreters, who were *viva voce* to make men understand what was read, and not suffer them to be barbarians in the service of God; which is a tyranny that was unknown to former ages.

Of the *hermenevtæ*, or *interpreters*.

5. Another office, that must not wholly be passed over whilst we are upon this head, is that of the *notarii*, or *excerptores*, as the Latins call them; who are the same that the Greeks call ὀξυγράφοι and ταχυγράφοι, from their writing *short-hand* by characters, which was necessary in the service they were chiefly employed in. For the first use of them was to take in writing the whole process of the heathen judges against the Christian martyrs, and minutely to describe the several circumstances of their examination and passion; what questions were put to

Of the *notarii*.

[73] Expos. Fid. n. 21. (t. 1. p. 1104 c.) Ἑρμηνευταὶ γλώσσης εἰς γλῶσσαν, ἢ ἐν ταῖς ἀναγνώσεσιν, ἢ ἐν ταῖς προσομιλίαις.

[74] Ap. Vales. Not. in Euseb. de Martyr. Palæstin. c. 1. (v. 1. p. 407. n. 3.) Ibi ecclesiæ tria ministeria præbebat, unum in legendi officio, alterum in Syri interpretatione sermonis, et tertium adversus dæmones manus impositione consummans.

them; what answers they made; and whatever passed during the time of their trial and suffering. Whence such descriptions were called *Gesta Martyrum, the Acts and Monuments of the Martyrs;* which were the original accounts which every Church preserved of her own martyrs. The first institution of these *notarii* into a standing office at Rome, bishop Pearson[75] and some other learned persons[76] think, was under Fabian in the time of the Decian persecution. For in one of the most ancient Catalogues[77] of the bishops of Rome, Fabian is said to have appointed seven subdeacons to inspect the seven notaries, and see that they faithfully collected the acts of the martyrs. But though it was no standing office before, yet the thing itself was always done by some persons fitly qualified for the work; as appears from the ancient Acts of Ignatius and Polycarp, and several others, which were written before Fabian is said to have instituted public and standing notaries at Rome. In afterages these notaries were also employed in writing the Acts of the Councils, and taking speeches and disputations, and whatever else passed in the synod. Thus Eusebius[78] notes, 'that Malchion's dispute with Paulus Samosatensis in the Council of Antioch was recorded, as it was spoken, by the notaries, who took it from their mouths:' and Socrates[79] says the same of the disputation between Basilius Ancyranus and Photinus, in the Council of Sirmium. We read also of a sort of notaries in councils whose office was to recite all instruments, allegations, petitions, or whatever else of the like nature was to be offered or read in council. And these were commonly deacons, and sometimes a presbyter was the chief of them, and thereupon

[75] De Success. Episc. Rom. dissert. 1. c. 4. n. 3. (v. 2. p. 314.) Neque hoc mirum, &c.

[76] Fell, Not. in Cypr. Ep. 12. [al. 37.] (p. 188. n. 2.) Hoc fere tempore, sub initiis Decii, Fabianus Romæ septem instituisse dicitur subdiaconos, qui septem notariis imminerent, et gesta martyrum in integro colligerent.

[77] Catalog. Rom. Pontiff. in Fabian. (ap. Ciacon. Vit. Pontific. et Cardinal. Romæ, 1677. t. 1. p. 155 c. 6.) ..... Regiones urbanas septem diaconibus divisit, septem quoque subdiaconos creavit, qui septem notariis imminerent, ut gesta martyrum integre collecta diligenter describerent, &c. (It. ap. Panvin. Epitom. Venetiis, 1557. p. 8. 31.)

[78] L. 7. c. 29. (v. 1. p. 359. 10.) *Οὗτος γέ τοι [Μαλχίων] ἐπισημειουμένων ταχυγράφων, ζήτησιν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐνστησάμενος ἣν καὶ εἰς δεῦρο φερομένην ἴσμεν, μόνος ἴσχυσε τῶν ἄλλων κρυψίνουν ὄντα καὶ ἀπατηλὸν φωράσαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον.*

[79] L. 2. c. 30. (v. 2. p. 129. 11.) *Ἐφ' ὧν ἀντικατέστη τῷ Φωτεινῷ Βασίλειος ὁ τῆς ἐν Ἀγκύρᾳ τότε προεστὼς ἐκκλησίαις, ὀξυγράφων τε τὰς φωνὰς αὐτῶν γραφόντων.*

styled *primicerius notariorum;* as in the Acts of the general Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon[80] there is frequent mention of Aëtius, deacon and notary, and Peter, presbyter of Alexandria, and *chief of the notaries, primicerius notariorum.* There were also notaries that were employed to take the discourses of famous and eloquent preachers from their mouths; by which means, Socrates[81] observes, many of St. Chrysostom's sermons were preserved, and some of Atticus, his successor. Bishops also had their private *ὑπογραφεῖς*, which some call notaries; but Valesius[82] reckons them in the quality of readers. Whatever they were, Athanasius served in this office as *ὑπογραφεὺς* under Alexander, and Proclus under Atticus, as Socrates[83] informs us.

6. The curious reader, perhaps, will find several other of these lesser offices, which he will think might come into this catalogue; but, that I may not seem too minute in small matters, I will only add one office more, which is that of the *apocrisiarii*, or *responsales.* These were a sort of residents, in the imperial city, in the name of foreign Churches and bishops, whose office was to negociate, as proctors, at the emperor's court, in all ecclesiastical causes wherein their principals might be concerned. The institution of the office seems to have been in the time of Constantine, or not long after, when, the emperors being become Christians, foreign Churches had more occasion to promote their suits at the imperial court than formerly. However, we find it established by law in the time of Justinian: for in one of his Novels[84] it is ordered, 'that forasmuch

Of cri res

[80] C. Ephes. Act. 1. ap. Act. 1. C. Chalced. (t. 4. p. 206 d.) Ἀέτιος διάκονος καὶ νοτάριος εἶπεν.—Ibid. (p. 291 d.) Petrus presbyter Alexandriæ et primicerius notariorum dixit.

[81] L. 6. c. 4. (v. 2. p. 313. 36.) Ὁποῖοι δέ εἰσιν οἵ τε ἐκδοθέντες παρ' αὐτοῦ λόγοι, καὶ οἱ λέγοντος αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ τῶν ὀξυγράφων ἐκληφθέντες, ὅπως τε λαμπροὶ, καὶ τὸ ἐπαγωγὸν ἔχοντες, τί δεῖ νῦν λέγειν, ἐξὸν τοῖς βουλομένοις αὐτοὺς ἀναλέγεσθαι, κ. τ. λ.—It. l. 7. c. 2. (ibid. p. 348. 24.) Οὐ μὴν τοιοῦτοι ἦσαν οἱ λόγοι, ὡς καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἀκροατῶν σπουδάζεσθαι, ἢ γραφῇ παραδίδοσθαι.

[82] Not. in Socrat. l. 5. c. 22. (ibid. p. 296. n. 1.) In actione prima Synodi Ephesinæ, Epaphroditus dicitur lector et notarius Hellanici, episcopi Rhodiorum. Ex quibus patet, idem fere fuisse officium notarii, quod lectoris, ut scilicet psalmos, aut alios sacræ scripturæ libros, vel in ecclesia vel coram episcopo legeret.

[83] L. 7. c. 41. (v. 2. p. 391. 5.) ... Τὰ πολλὰ παρῆν τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ Ἀττικῷ, ὑπογραφεὺς αὐτοῦ τῶν λόγων γενόμενος.—[Conf. Sozom. l. 2. c. 17. (ibid. p. 67. 37.) Μετοὐπολὺ δὲ ὁμοδίαιτον καὶ ὑπογραφέα τὸν Ἀθανάσιον εἶχεν. Ed.]

[84] Novel. 6. c. 2. (t. 5. p. 55.) ... Propterea sancimus, si quando pro-

as a bishop was to be long absent from his Church without special warrant from the emperor: if, therefore, any one had occasion to represent any ecclesiastical cause at court, he should prefer his petition either by the *apocrisiarius* of his Church, whose business was to act in behalf of the Church and promote her affairs, or else by the *economus*, or some other of his clergy, who was properly to signify his request." It does not, indeed, appear from that law, that these *apocrisiarii* were of the clergy; but from other writers we may easily collect it. For Liberatus says[85] Anatolius, a deacon of Alexandria, was *apocrisiarius*, or resident for Dioscorus, his bishop, at Constantinople, by which means he gained a favourable opportunity of being chosen bishop of Constantinople upon the death of Flavian. And Evagrius[86] observes the same of Eutychius, that, from being *apocrisiarius* to the bishop of Amasia, he was immediately advanced to be bishop of the royal city after Menas: which seems plainly to imply that he was one of the clergy before, since it does not appear that he was promoted *per saltum*. I must further observe, that, in imitation of these *apocrisiarii* in the Church, almost every monastery had their *apocrisiarii* likewise, whose business was not to reside in the royal city, as the former did, but to act as proctors for their monastery, or any member of it, when they had occasion to give any appearance at law before the bishop under whose jurisdiction they were. This is clear from another of Justinian's Novels[87], which requires the ascetics in such cases to answer by their *apocrisiarii*, or *responsales*. And these were sometimes also of the clergy, as appears from the Acts of the fifth

pter ecclesiasticam occasionem inciderit necessitas, hanc aut per eos, qui res agunt sacrarum ecclesiarum, quos apocrisiarios vocant, aut per aliquos clericos huc destinatos, aut œconomos suos notam imperio facere, &c.

[85] Breviar. c. 12. (CC. t. 5. p. 759 a.)... Ordinatusque est pro eo [Flaviano] Anatolius diaconus, qui fuit Constantinopoli apocrisiarius Dioscori.

[86] L. 4. c. 38. (v. 3. p. 418. 28.)... Εὐτύχιος παρὼν τὴν θείαν ἐς ἄκρον ἐξησκημένος γραφὴν, ἐσέτι ζῶντος Μηνᾶ, οὐδὲ τῶν διαφανῶν ὢν· ταῖς γὰρ ἀποκρίσεσι τοῦ Ἀμασείας ἐπισκόπου διηκονεῖτο .. ὅπερ καὶ Ἰουστινιανὸς ἐγνωκὼς ἐς τὸν τῆς βασιλευούσης αὐτὸν ἀνεβίβασε θρόνον παραυτίκα Μηνᾶ τελευτήσαντος.

[87] Novel. 79. c. 1. (t. 5. p. 366.) Propterea igitur sancimus, si quis quamcunque habuerit causam cum aliquibus venerabilibus sanctimonialibus, aut sacris virginibus aut mulieribus omnino in monasteriis consistentibus, Deo amabilem civitatis illius episcopum interpellet: ille vero mittat .... sive oportet per abbates, sive per responsales, sive per alios quoslibet hoc fieri.

general council, where one Theonas[88] styles himself presbyter and *apocrisiarius* of the monastery of Mount Sinai. The Latin translator calls him *ambasiator*, which is not so very proper, yet it in some measure expresses the thing: for, as Suicerus observes[89], in process of time the emperors also gave the name of *apocrisiarii* to their own ambassadors, and it became the common title of every legate whatsoever: which I the rather note, that the reader may distinguish these things, and not confound the civil and ecclesiastical sense of the name *apocrisiarius*[90] together. And thus much of the inferior orders and offices of the clergy in the primitive Church.

[88] Ap. C. Gen. 5. Act. 1. in Libell. Monachor. Syriæ Secundæ. (t. 5. p. 116 a.) Θεωνᾶς . . . . πρεσβύτερος, καὶ ἀποκρισιάριος τοῦ ἁγίου ὄρους Σινᾶ.

[89] Thes. Eccles. (t. 1. p. 456.) Successu temporis quemvis legatum ἀποκρισιάριον vocabant.—Nicetas in Manuele Comneno, l. 6., Πέμψας ἀποκρισιαρίους πρὸς βασιλέα πάλιν περὶ εἰρήνης διαλέγεται.—Conf. Isidor. Pelus. Ep. 143. l. 4. (p. 453.) Τὴν τιμίαν κέλευσιν τοῦ εὐσεβοῦς καὶ θεοπροβλήτου ἡμῶν μεγάλου βασιλέως, πρῶτον μὲν διὰ τοῦ βασιλικοῦ ἀποκρισιαρίου μαθόντες. *Grisch.*]

[90] [My learned ancestor printed this word in his original edition without the letter *i* in the fourth syllable. Nevertheless I have not hesitated to restore the just orthography of the term, originally Greek: neither can I find any authority, even in the Latin writers, for *apocrisarius*, which I consequently regard as corrupt. Vide Du Fresne, Glossar. Med. et Infim. Latinitat. Francofurt. 1681. (t. 1. p. 253.) in voce *apocrisiarius*, so spelt throughout, whether in Greek or Latin. Ed.]

END OF VOL. I.